श्रीमती प्रतिभा देवीसिंह पाटील : नहीं, मैं उम्र नहीं पूछ रही हूं । . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री पर्वतनेनि उपेन्द्र : और वह भी किसी बेचलर से । . . . (व्यवधान)

श्रीमती प्रतिभा देवीसिंह पाटील . मैं क्या कहना चाहती हूं, आप सुनने की कोशिश कीजिए । मैं यह कह रही हूं कि अपनी पचास या पचपन साल की उम्र में अपने जीवन में लाने की किसी एक महिला के बारे में वह राय नहीं बना सके, तो कोई डिप्टी चेयरमैन जो दो साल के लिए थी, उसके लिए वह क्या कह सकते हैं ।

तो मैं आपकी कठिनाई जरूर समझती हूं और बगैर राय बनाने के भी जो आपने अच्छे शब्द कहे, इसके लिए मैं आपकी बहुत आभारी हूं ।

मैं सभी सदन की भी बहुत आभारी हूं और चेयरमैन साहब आपकी तो बहुत-बहुत आभारी हूं । . . .

**SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION**
**Bofors gun deal**

UR. CHAIRMAN: Short Duration Discussion. Skri Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): I am on a point of order. j

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, point of order. We have also given you certain notices for discussion on the most baseless, malicious; and politically motivated allegations made by Shri V. P. Singh against Mr. Gandhi, our Prime Minister, What has happened to our notices?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was decided in the meeting of the leaders of the Opposition and your party leaders also.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: What will happen to our notices?

MR. CHAIRMAN.- Vou wijl discuss everything...

SHRl ALADi ARUNA *abus* V. ARUNACHALAM < Tamil Nadu): You ask you-leader as to what has happened in the meeting.. .. *(Interruptions)*.. This is the consensus.

LThe Vice-Chairnnn (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the C'.iair,]

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chaiiman, Sir, in the history of Parliament, we have discussed in the past, many scandals, many sordid events. We have debated the Mundhra scandal, we have debated the *j~cp scandal and, iike that,* ne *have* been diseussing many sordid developments in our body politic. But never and never had we a scandjl like Bofors with gigantic Himalayan, ramifications.

When this debate began in April last year, I never thought that the Bofors gun deal would give rise to controversies and snch vital and irreconcilable diffeiences hetwscn the ruliag party and the Opposition.

This scandal has shaken in my view the very moral foundation of our political system. I am not looking at this obviously from a narrow angle. I am not here to score points against the Government and the ruling party. I am raising this issu; from .< broader angle whether our system the political system can effectively deal wilh such scandals effectively and in conformity with domestic values and traditions wc cherish.

Various things have been debated in the Pavt. The report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Bofors gun de;'I has also been debated. It is not necessary for me to go over once again the whole ground which has been covered. The Government, the various Ministers nnd particularly the Prims Minister have taken varying positions irreconcilable, Utterly contradictory positions so far as the Bofors gun deal is concerned. One thine stands out Sir. you will agree with me, that at no time in these 40 years of our parliamentary life have we seen the

Government wilting so much under the attack as on today. No other scandal, no other i^ue shook the Government as *Vis* Bofors gun deal. This has got to

I
bp admitted.

When the Swedish radio broadcast this issue and said that kickbacks were involved in the Bofors gun deal, the statement wg got from the Government side was that the report was mischievous baseless and false. There was statement after statement saying that no middlemen WL-re involved, no commission was paid. That was the basic stand of the Governrnent. We questioned that stand. Even now that is the central issue, focal issue, whether there were middlemen involved in the gun deal and, if so. whether Commision has been paid to them, contrary to the decision of the Government. The Government took several positions. They said there were no middlemen, no commissions. Later they said only winding up charges have been paid to certain agents. Then they said no Indian is involved: then they said no non-resident Indian is involved; then they said no politician is involved. And to cap it all, the Prime Minister had to say that he is not involved and his family is not involved. Now he has conte out *with* another statement that he has no account in Lie Swis-j Bank. The basic question is whether commission was paid whether middlemen were there, whether kickback was involved, whether bribery was paid Ia influence decision in favour of Bofors. Other issues are peripheral issues. A great denl was made out on termination charges given to these companies-Svenska, A. E. Services, Moresco and others. *I* have got records to show that no termination charges were paid but only commissions were paid. Sir, A.E. Services were paid commission. I have got record here. It says: Commissions due to you 50. 463.96 SEK. The word used is commission not termination charges. I have similar commissions referred to here. We huve payments made to Svenska Incorporated. Invoice No. and date is given. On 8-12-1986. .

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRl P. SHIV SHANKER): May I just ask him a clarification? Is it other than what has already appeared in *The Hindu* and other papers or is it something new?

SHRl M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Most of them are from *The Hindu.*

SHRl PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: They have been confirmed by the PM.

SHRl M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Invoice No. 1014836 dated 8-12-1986—4,729.190 SEK was paid to Svenska in corporated. Again to Svenska Invoice No. 1013501 and 1013503, dated 9-1-1986 and 10-1-1986. For both, 422909.40 SEK has been paid. On 19-2-1987 in voice No. 1012008—134,225.34 SEK has been paid. There are other payments also on 25-2-1987, 26-2-1987 and again 26-2-1987. 4-3-1987, 4.3.1987. Total SEK 469,864.66 has been paid. All commissions \vere due to material supply tt> the Secretary to the Government of India. They relate to the supply. They aie not charges paid for terminating the contract. Then, on 16-9-1987 also there has been a pavment of SEK 68695.76 and to the AE Services. Sir, I have got documents here referring to one Marshi and reference Tulip, another Lefontr *Lotus, another* reference *Mont Blanc and* reference 35. "The commission due to you for deliveries during the fourth) quarter 1986 SEK 92,697.28 has been paid on 18-12-1986." So there have been several payments made to these accounts. There have also been payments to-Moresco. I have got the entire payment made to Morasco and Pitco accounts. All these show that commissions have been paid. They are not termination charges or winding up charges. The Prime Minister has given an interview to the "Sunday" magazine. He has admitted "there might be middlemen". He says "perhap, if was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors." H© goes on to say "we cannot question it if there is genuine work done on behalf of Bofors." It is a new element. What is new about it? He never said before that work was done on behalf of the Bofors by middlemen for which payment has been made. That was not the stand on the Government earlier, and the Joint Parliamentary Committee took the same

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

stand that there were no middlemen. Here is a confession made by the Prime Minister th.it there might be middlemen.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DEitAl): Might be.

SHRl M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: "Might be" is my woid and not his word. He was very positive. 1 am giving the benefit of doubt. "If it was. paid for some genuine work gathering information against the French weapon." Thus he goes on. He explains "there is ' an industrial espionage" He' says "I am saying .the whol; amount could have been P[a]id for genuine work. Then, we cannot que-tion it-" Here *fc* th$_e$ Prime Mi-ni^ttlr of this great country who has taken a brief on behalt of Bofors. Eeven Bofors did not take this stand before tho Joint Parliamentary Committee. Fct the first time, we have been to!d by th.' Pr me Minister that for the genuine work done by the middlemen, 64 crores of rupees has been paid and he does not remember evtn Rs. 64 crores also. When he was asked by the journalists, hr said. ves. Rs. 64 crores might have been paid for genuine work done by the middlemen. J have jiven to the House the various payments made by Bofors to their agsnts ;:nd nowhere 1 fiaJ the woik "winding up charges". Tn al! the payments made to various ageneies, the word "commission" has been mentioned in respect of supplies mads on bihalf of Bofors to India in th; gun deal, iilir, what is the inference then? Obviously, tha previous stand of the Go-ernment and the Prime Minister was untenable and the Government has admitted that payment mad$_e$ to middlemen was compensation for the genuine work done by middlemen on their behalf, on behalf of Bofors. If that is so, where do we stand? Either the Prime Minister is misleading the Parliament and the people of India or he is trying to cover up a shady deal by resorting to various subterfuges and various statements. Otherwise, we cannot make out the stand of the Prime Minister. To be very frank, the Prime Minister has avoided the two Houses of Parliament. Whenever we took up Bofors gun deal for discussion, in a way, ther is a suspicion cast in my mind, why is ho avoiding debate? He ii putting up spokesman after spokesman to speak on his behalf, on beha'jf of the Government of lndia. It is not objectionable. But *why* does he not come and defend himself, on the floor of the House? This scandal has shaken up his credibility. 1 may say, destroyed his credibility.

Nobody believes him. Why not he be here? Even now I request him that he must be here.

SHRT P. SHIV SHANKER: H$_e$ has made the position absolutely clear in the House itself when he said that "I have nothing to do and neither any member of my family has anything to do." This has been made clear. Now, what more do y^Li want? You are saying that he shou'd defend himself. Why should he defend himself after saying this?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, S:r. Mr, P. Shiv Shv.> ker is a very intelligent man, very honourable man.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: So ar? vou-

SHR! M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: But h; will agree with me when I say that it is possible to have an account. My money can be kept bv somebody else in his name. It i$_s$ riot necessary for me ta keep my money in mv own name and in my own account. It is possible. .*(Interrupt ions).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): Please listen There are about twenty-five Members who want tD speak on this. Even if they take about 10 minutes each, it will require more than four hours and then the Minister will have to reply. We have to do this in such a manner that within four or five hours we can finish this business. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alim* V. ARUNACHALAM: No. It is a lengthy discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): So, shall we skip the luneh hour today?

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: We want the lunch-hour.

i SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): We need lunch.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I am leaving it to your option. Can we skip the lunch-hour?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Padesh); Tfle speech can be resumed after the lunch-brake.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The House now stands Qdjourned for flinch and wil'i meet again at 2.JO. p.m.

> The House[1] then adjourned for lunch at thirty-one minutes past [1] tme of the clock.

The House reassembled, after lunch. ;it thirty-one minutes past two of the clock, The Vice-Cuai.-man [Shri Jagesh Desai) in the chair]

. SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Mr. Vice Chairman, in the pre-lunch hour T was saying that the payments made to various agencies like Svenska, Moresco and AE Services were not winding up charges, they were: commissions paid to middlemen and.these commissions were paid violating the Government of India decision. These comnvssi'.ms were made all along, the denials of the Government of India are not strictly to be believed and these firms were bhrlf firms or bluff companies or iron! companies or front organisations which took money from Bofors to be transferred to some other unknown individuals. This is my charge. The Government took the position, as you are aware that the Public Prosecutor in Sweden Mr. Lars Ringberg did not continue his investigation and closed it and the interference drawn from that was he had no case agaiiist Bofors. Later on, the Swedish Government itself and the Swedish Parliament took up this issue and the Director of Public Grievances of Swedish Parliament asked the Appellate Public Prosecutor to prosecute two or four, 1 am not very sure, Directors of Bofors foi indulging in fabrication, falsehood, cheating a/id misleading their Parliament and misleading their people. It has come out in the Swedish Press that Bofors were suppyin.: arms and ammunition illegally, clandestinely, to some of the Middle-East countries and Taiwan. Al'l these things have been discovered after the Bofors deal with lndia. Therefore, the stand of the Governmsnt of India that they did what all they could in approaching the Govei nment et Sweden, the Public Prosecutor there, to help them in finding out the truth beh'nd this payment cannot be believed. Th; Government of India even today must make a reference, must make a request, to the Swedish Government and the Appellate Public Prosecutor there to carry on the investigation and to unearth the secret, to unearth the Jruth. behind this deal.

Sir, th» Joint Pai liamentary Committee did not take into consideration the disclosures made by the papers, 'The Hindu[1]' and the •"Indian Express" later on. Pa-liament is entitled to know from this Committee why this was not taken into consideration at all. Why was it not done? They could have taken more time; thev could have found out the veracity of the publications in the "Hindu" which appeared at that *ixvni;* hut they did not do that. All the statements Tiade by the Government of Tndia in this respect add to the confusion only. Sir, th= Prime Minister has told the journalists who interviewed him on behalf of the "Sunday" magazin:—I quote—

> "To the best of my knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process."

He has said, "to the best of my knowledge". Perhaps he had to say so. But I would like to know from the Prime Minister on what basis he could make that statement. It is known that payment has been made, Rs. 64 crores have been paid,

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy] by Bofors for this deal and it is also known ihat three front organisations haw been the recipients, that is, A.E. Services, Moresco and Svenska. But it is not known who are behind thes$_s$ front organisations. That is, the only thing that has got to be found out. But the Government has noi made sny effort to find out the truth from the Government of Sweden. They have not approached the Government of Sweden nnd they have not approached tha Government of Switzerland. At on$_e$ point of time, the Government of Switzerland. was prepared to give the information and Shri N.rayan Datt Tiwari. I think, ; in July JBM year, said that they would be making efforts.

' SHrai P SHIV SHANKER: Is it so?

SHR3 M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Yes, 1 will quote.

Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari, on 30th July. 1987, *..id like this:

> "Even without entering into a bilateral treaty with the Government of Switzerland ... We try to find out the truth." To tfc.it extent he has gone. I think, a memorandum of understanding ha$_s$ also been drafted...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION AND SUPPLIES IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI): You quoted just now that Mr. Narayan Dutt Tiwari has said that the Covernment of Switzerland is prepared. But you say that hs will try to find out.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Is it from Mr. Noorani's article?

SHRl M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I am quoting from the Indian Express dated November, 15th. It is from an article by Mr. Noorani. I am quoting from there.

Anyway, the point. Sir, is that it has been sr.id that the Government of India is makir.g an effort to find out the truth. And [ am to!d that a memorandum o£ understanding has also besa drafted fol that purpose. Till today I do not know what has happened to that, whether the Government is making efforts to find out all the account numbers and the people who are behind those accounts in the Swiss bank.

Sir, the whole thing boils down to this: The payment made to middlemen was for the purpose of influenc'ng the decision in favour of Bofors. And it is bribery to get the order of the Government of lndia ui its favour. Therefore, nothing is settled in the case of Bofors. Mr. K. C. Pant in the last session said that everything is over, curtain i$_s$ drawn on Bofors. Nothing i« drawn. It will go on till the truth is found out.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Till the elections.

SHRl SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Till you are defeated.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He is an honourable man. He is also a politician. *(InieVrupiions)* Sir I would demand a fresh probe into the whole thing—a fresh probe by a Joint Parliamentary Committee with comprehensive terms of difference.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY" AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOBl: Mr. Gurupadaswamy, you yourself wanted a parliamentary committee, in the first instance. But when the committee wa3 constituted you backed out. Again parliamentary committee?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): This time you be the Chairman, we wilt join.

SHRI M S. GURUPADASWAMY: You remember. I was the first who started *a* debate on Bofors. At that time I said that there should be a Joint Parliamentary Committee -and I thought that committee would have comprehensive terms of reference. But it was truncated;

the, inquiry was truncated. The report was also truncated. Therefore, 1 would like the Government to refer this issue once again to a Joint Parliamentary Committee with comprehensive terms of reference, the Chairman of that committee should be a member of the Opposition. Otherwise 1 go along with my friend, Mr. Arun Singh, who made a speech last time, demanding that Bofors should be black-listed. What prevents you from black-listing? The Prime Minister lias said that if black-listed it will affect the security Of the country. May I tell you, Sir, that if Bofors has committed such fraud and has indulged in falsification ol records, nothing short of black-listing that company needs to be done. If this is done, then I am sure that in future any company or any organisation which enters into a contract with the Government of India will be careful and there will bs tio repetition of sudh scandals* Therefore, J demand that BOFORS should be blacklisted. I further demand that this matter should be referred for inquiry by a Joint Parliamentary Committee in which an opposition member should be the Chairman anj the term's of reference for this purpose should be \ery comprehensive.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, the opposition has been anxious to discuss this issue once again. We have also been keen to discuss it for the simple reason that we think we have reached a stage! when v,e should tell them that enough is enough and that we are not willing to put up with what we consider a sheer sanctimionous Vuimbug and that Jet the issue be resolved once, for all.

Sir, this is the umpteenth time wc are debating this issue. I do not know how many dozens o^ times we have debated this very issue and this very demand which my dear friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, has made about having another committee, a large committee; this and that. For what? Where is it going to lead us? Where we navе come? What has this House been reduced to? We are not worried about terrorism in Punjab. We are not worried about the very dis- i mai fiscal situation in the country. We are not worried about the political ideologies and perceptions, so essential to build up our democracy. We are not worried about unemployment. We are not worried about poverty alleviation. But my friends on my right hand must cling on every time in Parliament session—winter session, monsoon session or budget session—to this issue. In the first few days of every session, they must stick ou to this straw of BOFORS scandal before they think totally and conclusively and finally. How long will it go On like this? Ihe new generation is looking up to us and it is rightly impatient. It wants better economic amenities and securities. They are no longer interested in this kind of debate going on in season and out of season — and mostly out of season — in this House. Tney are no longer interested in tall talks of anybody which is a damp squib, which the BOFORS scandal is and has proved to ba every time.

Sir I have studied the documents. I have studied the documents with my background in the accountancy profession and in the background of long years which T have spent in the practice of taxation. What conclusions 1 have come to I shall be coming to it later. But I understand that the very debate proceeds upon an assumption that a charge has been levelled by Mr. V. P. Singh of bribery and corruption relating to BOFORS deal. The Times of India dated 9th November reported a charge by Mr. V. P. Singh. Depending on these three documents his charge was that Shri Rajiv Gandhi has deposited an equivalent of 8 and odd crores of rupees received in BOFORS deal. Sir, I don't have the paper here. But this is the gist. I believe that in the other House, the Speaker said to Mr. V. P. Singh: "Do you reiterate this charge?" And there was, no reaffirmation of this charge by Mr. V. P. Singh in the olher House. If that be tt'e slory and what 1 am stating here is correct, then what are we debating: Mr. Guru pa.J a wa my? *ilnterruptions).* You yourself said, Mr. Gurupadaswamy. I have listened tQ your speech.

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): I have something to say and \ou can give your decision on it. *(.Intemiptions)* I am on a point of order. Sir. Sir, the time of this august House is very precious. In this House Members are expected to discuss matters of national importance.. .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAT): Bu$_t$ the Chairman...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA; Sir, please! listen to me fully. After what Mr. Salve has said, what arc we discussing today? This entire discussion is based on contradictory statements made by Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh on 5th and 7th of November, -and he himself has denied. He has refused to own those statements in the other HOIKC Why arc »-« wasting the time? *(liitemtpthmt)*

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM. Sir, have you allowed him?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am exercising my right. .. *(Interruptiom)*

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY tWest Bengal): Sir, sho are they to shout at him?

r ' *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DASAI"): Please be seated. I am on my legs. Yes, Mr. Salve.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, the very debate has been brought before the House. . . *(Interruption'.)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Chairman has allowed this discussion.. .

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: He has made a point of order. Who are they to shout at him? *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. I have not allowed. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY:** .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI I AG ESH DESAI): Nothing will 50 on record. Yes, Mr. Salve,

SHRl N. *K*.. P. SALVE: Sir, Mr. V. P. Singh. .

SHRI DARBARA SINGH (Punjab): His kept mum and he could not reply to those charges.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, I submit for your consideration. .. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Our Chairman has allowed as Short Duration Discussion on this, and the matter will go on.

SHRI N. K P. SALVE: Even otherwise. Sir. as I submitted it was a damp squfbv The whole debate has reduced itself to a: damp squib because. Sir. I want to submit; what was the basis of t'ne entire debate, why did we have to suspend all the rules and bring in this Short Duration Discussion. It i$_s$ because various averments have been made by Mr. V. P. Singh outside and the Preys has been carrying I hat. And the gravamen of his charge is that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has taken bribe in respect of Bofors deal. In fac*, Mr. Gu-rupadaswamy very fairly i$_n$ the initial stages of hij j'peech said—T quote him—that tho basic issue Ls whether kickbacks are involved, whether bribery was involved in the Bofors deal. You have yourself said that. Tt is not your own charge, Mr. Gurupadaswamy. I submit wi'h respect to you. It is a charge you are reiterating on the basis of -omebody else, your leader who is coming out as a paragon of virtue after having gone from our Party, $_a$ mes-siah of incorruptibility and honesty. When asked upon by [lie Speaker 'o say, "Are you reiterating this charge?", he observed silence. If that be the situation, what are we discussin ; and what are we discussing for? The minimum that I submit. Sir, *i** ifc»t to get out of it at this stage is the height of cowardice tit which I will not b$_e$ surprised. Sir, T want to submit. . .

"Not recorded.

SHRl ANAND SHARMA: He is takins eVerybod\ for ,i ride.

!$HRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes >ou can fool somebody for all the time, ;ill the people for some tim£i but not all the people for all the time. . . *(Interruption)*

THE V IC F CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-H8H DESAI): Mr. Anand Sharma, you wil] gel a chance. You are the secaml speaker fiom thK side.

SHRl SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY; He rrtost tell us what he did in New York.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAT): No cross-talk, please.

SHRl *X.* K. P. SAEVE: Sir, I was submitting to you. I was tiying to exapifne the validity of this kind of argument being Haunted against us that these documents lertd us to an infallible inference that there has been bribery, there have been kick-btfeks, there has been dishonesty, and that there has been corruption. Sir, I have the privilege of belonging to the same profession to which you belong. For long many years, I have been in the profession of Accountancy, and : for large many years I hav© been in the practice of taxation. Therefore, Sir....

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You know better how to cfaiaige the .iccount head.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE; Therefore. Sir. as an expert, T do claim to be having some expertise for evaluation of documents of this type. Hundreds and thousands of invoices I have examined in the course of my auditing profession and millions of documents I have had to examine
and work upon and argue before the court to establish this kind of an allegation that "x LS involved or y is involved, or that x has defrauded the revenue or y has defrauded the revenue, and that is why for large years of my life, best years of my life, this was Part of my profession. And I want to submit as an expert, at the very outset, that for the reasons which I will enumerate now hereafter, a little later, :T J submit that unless one is disposed of
his rational faculties he would never accept that these documents are worth more than the paper on which photostat copies have been obtained to prove a charge of bribery or ,1 kickback. They are not even worth the value of the paper on which the photostat copies have been taken. Sir. I ean understand that in any democratic polity there is going to be, we have given to ourselves party politics, there ts bound to be some sort of political gimmickery^ there is some sort of political skulduggery which mu^t go on to wheel the people on your side, but that far and no further. Sir, should it be taken to a point where you are likely to destroy the very credibility of your democratic polity, where you are likely to destroy the very foundation of ihe democratic institutions, important democratic Inttitutions, where you are likelv *to aftec^ adversely ihe* institution of Parliiunentary democracy Sir, iu the garb of strengthening democracy, or cleansink or purging it from corruption, please do not take out the funeral of democracy every day. That is what is happening. What has happened. Sir? Here he has levelled charges against us here. I did not realise that his glass-house was much bigger than ours. There is a charge levelled against Mr. V. P. Singh of Himalayan dishonesty. He is alleged to have more than Rs. 750 crojes slashed in a Swiss bank account and proof of that is available wi'h Mr. Sathe. It is named in the Universe Mr. Visva. Will he be able to adduce one single evidence to prove that Mr. Sathe is wrong and he is rieht? What happenv to him now? The chickens have come home to roost. Not ., word i> said about this excepting that he has said you prove it. How do you disprove it, is the question. Sir, if T were to allege that so far as these documents arc concerned, assuming while ™>r conceding, they are true, 'hey are genuine, and that they are front companies for Mr. Gumpadaswamy or for Mr. Subramanian or for anybody, or for anybody here, is there any method by which they will be able te- disprove anybody's name, however innocent they may be, however unrelated they may be. and you prove somehing which you know it cannot be proved? Ts this *he basis. Can this be the foundation for this kind of a debate, if it is to be a serious debate? Ts it not

[Shri N. K. P. Salvd]

tmder-mining? l4 it not under-mining the very institution oi ihe Prime Ministership thut i.h's kind of charges are being levelled? Well if one were to say that these dotum;n.$ create sonic doubt, well they certainly created douht when we discussed 20 monthg ago or a year ago. soon after the Committee's report was out. Well at that time itself one could have said it takes us to some doubt, but will douM take the place ol pi oof and if you are levelling rhe charge of bribery .ind corruption, is the proof irrelevant, or is it enough ihat for purposes of aggrandizement .of political interest y°u w''' g^et U P ^^ <jay todav the Prime Minister has t^aken, tomorrow Shiv Shanker has taken and then Mr. Panigrahi has taken, such a lin: may in the Defence Ministry. How will fbey disprove, any one of them? Know-ins; rhi\ again times .vithout n umber _ in season and out of season as I said earlier, this is nought to be raised. Sir, I really wish that Mr. V. P. Sinsh honestly disproves to the hilt what Mr. Sathe has t-aid. Otherwise, he is no le*s innocent than what anyone else may be. whose name is being dragged very unfairly and unjustly, f am speaking for myself, this kind of an allegation does no good and if someone c-ame and talked to me. people !*ad com» and they did talk to me about massive fa's evasion and they talked of Missive moneys beine stashed in Swiss banks by some opposition parties. I -•onsider this plenty of aonsebse fret* reason that this kind ot an allegation *h* detrimental to the basic interest of Parliamentary democracy. If you want to nurse an institution, please do not take these matters so lightly, be serious about it cr keep your hand on your heart and say, this lead's us to an inference that nn Indian is involved, that a non-resident Indian fo involved, that you know who it is, whose if *i" f* front company, or whose front company it could be. It could be anybody's front company. There are SO many people living in Tndia and in the world. How can we be sure that it is not th? front company of somebody from Oiina or comebody from Timbuctoo, All sorts of wild allegations are sought to be made. V> view of your difficulty that we want to finish it today, I •will not take loo long. But let u'., try to evaluate the documents and statements 3 P.M from which Mr. V, P. Singh is backing out in the other House. Now, first and foreanost, I want to submit foe your consideration, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, are these documents not the very same which appeared earlier in Tne Hindu?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Yes, but they were not investigated.

SHRl N. K. P. SALVE: They have appeared in *The Hindu* much earlier, at 23. y of June, 1986.

SHRl M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: But they have not been investigated into

SHRl N. K. P. SALVE; Therefore, this evidence) by itself dose not take their case any farther than what the documents of Hindu had taken. Tt is a proposition 1 am formulating' i

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *dias* V. ARUNACHALAM: It has strengthened th; case.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: If somebody else issues the same document?, do they become more authentic? Do they become more veracious? Do they become more reliable? Do thev become more dependable? lt does .tot take their case any farther than what the case did take when the^e documents were published in *'!'!•• Hindu. (Interruptions).* Sir. 1 do not want to reply to every query. All thai I want to suhmi' is there is nothing new in these documents. It is the old document Only they are wanting to change the labels. Tf you are coming to this Hou%e with an allegation, and as you yourself said that the basic question is of bribery, of kickbacks, how can you say—if you could not at that juncture ever say—that someone has taken the kickback, or someone has induleed in bribery or corruption and who that person, the recipient of that bribery and corruption is? How are you in a better posWon to say the same very thing today? By raising the

aarae .mil same question again, by multiplying untruths and allegations, do you thick you are establishing the veracity, you aie establishing the truth or i the dependability of tha documents on the basi;,. of which you are levelling such a serious criminal charge on somebody, on the Prime Minister of this country? lt is very unfair, very unjust.

SHRl g. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: (Andhra Pradsh): It will come out.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes. that is why, your great leader, newly-found lea-Je*—I do not know who your lejader is N.TR o;-VPS—*your* newly—found le:ider, vow newly-found messiah, your political messiah our deserter initially said that these documents conclusively, positively, unequivocally prove that there is.

.SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It rs your party that supplies messiahs.

SMRI N *K* P. SAJLVE: I have respect for your party; but they are not willing, to work with you. They have some ideology. . Sir, I may not agree; but this party has some ideology and philosophy.

SKRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Wo .ire one with you against corruption. But don't try to...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am very happy that a Member of NTR's party says that he wants to fight corruption. I think charity begins at home. Let him start with that good work in his own State.

i SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN RFTJDY: But yoit could not prove anything: you are hiding what has been published wi *The Hindu.* Even till this day you have not been bold enough to have' a Parliamentary grouT* tr go into these charges

SHRl N. K. P. SALVE: T submit for your consideration: T hope this iiTelevan-ce wll not be counted in mv time Sir. I wr*, submitting, initial allegation was— I read it myself: I do not have got the cuttmr-straightaway, but nobody will deny here, that conclusive proof has come, as if some new document, some new jensatitonal document has come out of the electronic memory which he used to carry—the latest messiah, the political messiah—and from that, he has been able to rind some material which clinches the issue once for all, which decides the issue, that biibeiy has been taken in the Bofors deal, and lhe recipient of that M-bery is our revered leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Later on. when the senior mem bers Of the Cabinet said: Don't make t'nese wild, leckless, irresponsible charges without any circumspection, and it you have some proof come out Wth it', qiiis~ tly he tilted, qu etly he backed out and slid from the earlier position jnd now savs that these documents prove th'Jt commission has been paid, though earlier, we said that what h-id been paid was wind, ing up charge. 1 Viad the privilege, on be. half of my party, to participate in on^ of the Bofors debates, when Mr. Arun Singh spoke. I was the second speaker, from' our party. Mr. Amn Singh, Put ;i query to me n? to wViat is thi? winding up charge T said that I had never hearj anything by way of winding tw charge, lh:'t the nomenclature was unknown to me. T said that the cruciat question was the one raised by Mr. Gurupadaswamy whether, under the grab of this windino up charge, any bribery oi corruption Viad taken place. What is the magic in these words winding up charges? It is only those people in the Bofors who are using these words. You mav call if winding up charge. You may call it solatium for termination of contract or vou may call it bv any other name. Wha' does 't mitter? The crucial question is whether you have documents which rr*w-' any bribery or corruption. whicVi n-ive is any manner whatsoever tfhat someone .. *(Interruptions).* The crucial question. is whether any of these documents will[1] the wildest of imagination applied *tv* them. on whatever basis vou are falling back upon, pi ove that there has been bribery. You hare, referred to certain non co-operation with the prosecutor in Sweden etc. Assuming that ir is correct, does <lt prove that there has been bribery corruption nnd that the decision of fhe Govemmment Jia* been influenced? Tt has been accepted even bv the O--

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

posiuon tint this has 'been the best buy. We could not have purchased anything betie$_r$ for this kind of money. To those who are arguing that we should resile from the contract because commission has bee$_n$ paid by Bofors, I would submit that they are suggesting to cut our own n$^{0s}$e $^{to\ s}$P$'^{tc}$ ourseives. At that price, they will be too happy today not to give us their gun. We will have to go once again for some! other gun. What happens? Th$_e$ supplier of some othe$_r$ gun will also pay commission somewhere. Then, you resile from that contract also with the result that perennially you starve yourself of the vital equipment necessary for India's defence and security.

Sir, mv submission is that if the docu ments are really strong enough, if they are adequate enough, to lead anybody with a judicial mind to come to the con clusion ttiat there ha$_s$ been some kind of hanky-panky, I would have understood thi$_s$ kind of thing being suggested, not even being implemented. But I submit that these documents are not even worth the paper on which they have been writ ten. On the basis of such documents, you are wanting us to ′ take upon ourseives the onerous, more cumbersome and mor$_e$ duffic-ult situation of cancelling the contract when it has been admitted by everyone that the price we paid was fairer than thq best. This is rne cheapest buy and this is the best buy. Why do we deny that to lndia?

Assuming for a moment that someone has taken commission, assuming fo$_r$ a moment that there i$_s$ an element of dishonesty, should ftv counlry be divested of its right to acquire weapons, crucial weaipons, needed for India's defance? This is the cheapest and the best buy. Under no circumstances, should this ever he accepted. We opposed it last time when Mr. Arun Singh suggested that Bofors should be asked to nav back the money, or. we should blacklist them and terminate ihe contract. If you terminate the contract, you do not penalise Bofors. Von do not nenalise tho*: who have taken commission. You are only going to penalise your country, your- own nation.

and you are going to impoverish your own defence which should not be done undei any circumstances.

Sir, politics should take you quite to some extent in wanting to diswrt things. But let us not take it to a point where the country's vital defence interests arc- involved. Nobody has see$_n$ the original document. Even Mr. V. P. Singh is not willing to say. He says that this is a pho tostat copy of the original. This i$_s$ a document, the authenticity of which, the veracity of which, is not established by anyone. This is a secondary documepl Primary document none has seen. NtMje i$_s$ willing to testify that this is a true copy of the original. Wnat is its worth then? Forget about proving it in a court of law. Forget about technical rules of evidence. Ca$_n$ this be accepted even by a person possessed of commonsense? When nobody has seen the original, wh«n nobody is willing to say that he has see$_n$ the original, o$_n$ the basis of such a photostat copy, which is wholly unverifi ed, which is whollj unauthenticated, you are charging someone with corruptiotf? Sir, what has happened to our newspapers? I do not understand. They are giving broad headlines every day. I wish some newspapers sat critically and seen whether fhe-se documents are any more than scraps of paper. If they find something, let them give publicity. I do concede. It is the duty of every newspape,- to take dissent to the corridors of power. But it is one thing to take dissent to the corridors of P°we$_r$ and it is another thing to indulge in -extremely unworthy gimmickry to wi ite things which arc only sensational but as $_a$ result of which, perhaps, tibere is hetter sale of the newspaper. Sir, I am a friend of the newspapers and journalists. I stand for total 'freedom of the press. "T hav$_e$ always said it and I stand bv it- Therefore, 1 am only laving this douW because I feel that ihe opposition on its own would never have take$_n$ up thi$_s$ issue had the newspapers been not giving ban ner headlines to all this. What has this Parliament come to? We com? here to debate issues on the basi$_s$ of what is re ported in the papers, it is not that they report somthin™ fo$_r$ the issues which we rai'se. They raise! issues for us and we merrilv take them

;

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : क्या आप अखबार को पैर जिम्मेदार समझते हैं . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: 1 maintain thai it is fop the dignity of this House, it is ifor the opposition parties, it is for us to raise issues of naional importance and so atoo in fete public life we raise important issues, but something his appeared in the newspapers somewhere and wc take it as our cause. That is a very unfortunate situation, that will not add to the dignity of this House or this Chamber.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : अखबार तो जम्हूरियत के रक्षक हैं ।

श्री एन०के०पी० साल्वे : मैं तो खुद इस बात को मानता हूं ।

Sir, there aie three invoices. Now, see ■*ihe* merits of these three invoces, see t'ne internal conflict which cornes. There are 3 invoices and the first invoice is of 8.12 1986. Sir, it relates to Bofors but it does not [ciate of 155mm guns, il relates to some trans'-icdo,, for modification kits which haj been pui chased by Government of India fo,- L70 guns I am making this specific allegation here, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, that the first document does not rclate to guns vViich have been purchased. It is Bofors but does not *e-late to the guns. What is the credibility of such a document, *n* document which does not relate to the commission in respect of which you are alleging? You are alleging kickbacks and bribery, W the document does not relate to the very transaction in respeel of which you are saying thai we 'nave received these monies. Should there be no sease of responsibility, should we not make such allegations with circumspection and understanding? I maintain that (his relates to Bofors but it doe* Hot relate to 155 mm guns, it relates to the kits which we have purchased for modification purpose for the L70 guns.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Did you buy something else from Bofors?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAl): May be of Bofors but fof somet'ning eke.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Yes. So, this Is $he story of tie first document on the basi;, of which wc a!e being damned, our party is being damned, our leader is be ing damned. Before nation it is sought to bu projected that we are a bunch of coi-lupt felIows without knowing that this document does not relate to the transac tion pr which 5011 arc calling us corrupt. What have we come to? However, wild an allegation may be, but should it be so wild that it has nothing to do with the transaction for which we are being alleg ed to have taken bribes? Sir, I distinctly remember that Shri V. P. Singh has nude another allegation that t'ne name 'Lotus' appears arij the Lotus means Rajiv. liw documents are in respect Of Svenska nnd, therefore, that Lotus and Rajiv business was given a back seat and what was said was that these are the front companies. He was the Finance Minister who clear ed it. How are they not his front com panies? A P=irt o»" this couLj as well be 7750 w'nich Mr. Sathe is referring to, nor ]. lt is easy to say, any company is a front company, but ls it a bazaar gossip we are going to discuss here, is it o,, the bazaar gossip that we are going to sus pend the rules for the whole day and dis cuss some matter of corruption ;ind bri ber}', not knowing for a moment, realis ing that in theie documents the inferences you yourself have drawn are all jumbled and confused? ' You did not *know* what you are! talking, about and '• when your attention was drawn and some light was thrown, then you decided to leccde back and slide back. What about a very glaring dishonesty on the entire approach? An allegation Was made that in these three invoices, the correct value of the commission paid Wks out to 3.20,76,709 Swedish Kroner. A cursory look at the document will show that this is the amount o" whicvi 6 per cent commission ls paid.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): Oh. it is « ner cent of this!

SHRI N K. P. SALVE: Yes. And the commission works out to ;, figure of 5,48,207,58. You are talking to the nation you a:c talking to the people »h,i inist you; who believe you. At least be honest 'n the fiaures. At least take eave to mn'e a proper cilculation. Take care to eci'.ni-

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

that you do not commit errors in these figures. And to what purpose? Either it is gross dereliction and criminal neglect on the part of Mr. V. P. Singh for which he wants to lie prostrate before the nation and appologise to them, or if it is not, then it is a type of dishonesty which will only perhaps suit a person who is in the habit of changing parties to parties to aggrandise his political ends. It is a disgrace of the worst type. Even in respect of figures which are so palpable and clear, you are not willing to be honest about the whole situation! In these last two documents, I want to submit for your consideration, only 0.96 commission is paid on the value mentioned therein and they relate to Svenska; they are not related to 'Lotus'.

In the end, all that I want to submit is, on an evaluation that I have made of the documents with some degree of indignation and some degree of distress, would any person who has not lost his thinking faculty ever think that these documents should be relied upon for alleging something in Parliament. If this debate is taken seriously, these documents should never have been fallen back upon for a debate in Parliament, nor should have been the reports in the papers which have been taken up. It is as a result of this that the Opposition has kept itself where it is.

Now an alliance has come—an alliance has come of different people. I do not know which ideology they profess. I do not know what is the common philosophy. I do not know what is the end and purpose except that they want removal of Rajiv Gandhi and the Congress. This is what earlier the other parties has tried to do. And all such parties had got together and they all came back from where they started, they went back to from where they started. That is the fate which awaits all these parties.

What I submit is that we need a strong Opposition. A strong Opposition is only the surest guarantee of a strong democracy. But we cannot think of a strong Opposition as long as the unprincipled, unscrupulous, ruthless and dishonest politicians are going to head the Opposition. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,....

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतुल्ला (महाराष्ट्र) : जिसने एलिगेशन लगाया है, वह तो चले गए (व्यवधान)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, have you finished? Can I start now?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I charge the Government with suppressing the facts and misleading the Parliament of India...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: But not corruption.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH:....and, for allowing corrupt practices to take place in acquiring the defence requirements of our country. Mr. Salve started his defence with what Mr. V. P. Singh is reported to have stated in the other House. Mr. Salve's whole argument stood on Mr. V. P. Singh's disclosure of the documents or Mr. V. P. Singh's statement. Sir, I know, it happens, since the Bofors ghost started haunting the ruling party. Now, still, Mr. V. P. Singh is haunting them. So they can't overrule what Mr. V. P. Singh states.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: He is now haunting you also.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: But, Sir, Mr. V. P. Singh issued the statement on 4th of November, and it appeared in the newspaper on 5th and 6th and, up to 11th of November. The Prime Minister himself had given an interview to the *Sunday* magazine of Calcutta on 28th and 29th of October, but this interview was published later. It was published on 13th of November—though the interview was given on 28th of October. It is now written in the interview itself. In the interview itself, the Prime Minister had admitted that commission was paid and maybe, for the better work done by Bofors. I will be quoting—I have got a copy, I don't know

whether they will refute this. The interview is a reproduction Of taperecordings of the statement.

Sir, on April 17, 1987, the Government had first made a statement on the lloor of both the Houses of Parliament that there was no commission agent and tfaut no commission was paid. Even the Prime Minister himself had staled that he got it authenticated from the late Mr. Oloi Palme, the then Prime Minister of Sweden, that there was no commission agent and no commission was paid. That wa^ the starting point. We have to judge these documents not simply from the point of view of a Chartered Accountant. These documents mean disclosure of fresh evidence about payment of commission in th, Bofois gun deal. So. it has to be look. ed at and examined from the point of view of a .Mcmher of Parliament representing the people of our country and not •rom the point of view of a Chartered Accountant defending a party who or wjjvft has emplo)ed him as a Chartered Accountant.

A^ HONOURABLE MEMBER. Not as Defence Minister . .*(interruptions)* . > -

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is not employed: he is an honourable Members of this House.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: On the floor of this House it was denied by the Prime Minister himself that there was no commission agent and no commission was paid. He got it authenticated by his talk with Mr. Olof Palme. These are all on record. Then the Resolution came.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Ghosh, the time is very much limited.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What I charge them with is suppression of fact, concealment of fact and misleading of the House. I start with this.

Then came the Resolution of the Working Committee of the AICC(I)—the theory of destabilization. Then, certain disclosures, certain revelations made by the National Audit Bureau of Sweden had led them to change their stand. The ruling party or, the Governmnet, changed Iheir stand. Then came the theory that in ihe matter of commission no Indian was involved. Then came the question that it was not commission but winding-up charges. On what the JPC lhad s'ated, during the last session whde debating on the JPC report or rather concluding the debate, ou,- Defence Minister, Mr. Pant, said that this entire debate would end because the JPC had done a splendid job. What a splendid job it did: The JK,' stated that there was no commission, no commission agent, that it was winding-up charge and that a winding-up charge could be taken and that no Tndian was involved. Even new Mr. Salve h»«s stated that thera is no question of asking the money back. Now- [ say what Mr. Prime Minister had . stated in his interview.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAD: 1 don't ihink. Mr. Salvo said like that.

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH: Yes. You cao chock up the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHR! JAGESH DESAI): I don't think so. You check up the record.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; Mi. Prime Minister was asked, "But 64 crores? For industrial espionage?" Mr. Prime Minister replied:

> "There are three or four payments. Could be ..I am not sr.ying it is... The whole thing may not be... hypo' thetically I am saying the whole amount could have been paid for genuine work. Then we can't question it. Tf ihe money has been paid for. ."

SHRIMATI JAYANTHl NATARAJAN (Tamil N.idu): Tt is hypothetical.

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH: But listen.

> "...as a commission and it has no* come to .tny Indian. . ."

*(Interruptions)*

THE VrCE-CHAIRMAN 'SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Let him speak.

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH.- $Y_{C}$S. one can say hypothetically. You can say hypolhit'-cally you do not exist here.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATAKA JAN: Are we going to hav$_{e}$ a parliamentary debate on a hypothetical question Are we going to waste the time of the House on a hypothetical question$^{0}$

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl IAGESH DESAI)- You cannot change hi> understanding,

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He says;

". . and it has not come to any Indian und tio Indian is involved and i; has gone back to.. "

It is incomplete

".. .1 don't know who on the other side."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): You are quoting from the magazine only.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It has not been denied, lt has been tape-recorded. If you say it is wrong, I will yt down. The Primt Minister is not here. Otherwise, 1 could have asked Ium to authenticate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAIj: It is a quotation from a magazine only.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *atias* V. ARU-NACHALAM: What is wron$_{?}$?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: $I_{t}$ is $_{a}$ taped interview published on the basi., of taped$^{1}$ record.

SHRI AI,\DI ARUNA ate V. ARU-NACHALAM: What is wrong? He has the right to quote.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN I SHRI JAGESH DESAT); All right.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: O. K. Then he says; J

"Then again we ca$_{n}$ be upset that wc have paid 66 crores exlnt."

All those things are theie By inference .it least one week ago belore Mr. V. P. Singh diijlosed something, eve$_{n}$ the Primo Minister himself has admitted to the press,-men in this interview to the "'SUNDAY-" magazine rhi't commission had been paid.

So long it wa> being said like that. Then where do we stand? Mr. Salve was charg ing Mr. V. P. Singh of changing colour thi,, way and (hat way, speaking untruth, all these lhings But under affirmation a Minister while making a statement on the floor of Parliament on April 17, 1987 said that stern action would be taken if it was proved that a commission was paid.

Then my first question fo whether the Government is going to take stern action against Bofors which has paid the commission as it has been admitced by the Prime Ministe$_{r}$ himself. The action against the person who has taken the commission is different. That has to be proved. But it (has been proved that Bofors has paid commission which wa$_{s}$ not to be paid according to the contract. Now, Mr. Salve, while examining, the invoices said that the invoices which have been produced ar rathe$_{r}$ disclosed through newspapers by-Mr. V. P. Singh, do not *inter alia* say that they were in connection with that gun deal. It was his contention. But he could not say that the invoices do not suggest that the commission was paid by Bofors to Svenska or Pitco or Moresco. He had to construct his argument by saying that ia the body of the invoice it was not written that the commission was P^d on account of supply of so and so guns to the Indian Govcrnme'nt. But what is written here? lt is written "cammission on material supplied to the Government of India according to our invoice so and so"; "Commission due to you an material supplied to the Secretary, Government of lndia. Ministry of Defence, according to our invoice so and so". Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you were also in this field as Mr. Salve has declared it. So. the question is whether on these commission invoices details of the deals are mentioned or not. It has men-tioned only the invoice number, date, order

nnmber under which materials were supplied. These documnets show tho commission paid on account of supplies of male-rials under so and so invoice number. da'ed so and so and order number so and so dated so and so. So. if number* of invoices are evrninoi one ean come to know which type of materials were supplied by the Bofors to the Government ol India, Ministry of Defence and for which this particular commission was paid. So. I start from what Mr. Salve suggested. That is why I had put a question to Mr Salvo: Did Bofors supply any other material not connected with that gun deal? And if so, whe'her the payment of the commission was illowed by the Goernment of Indu to Bofors on account.of the supplies[1] of such and such materials. He want ed to say that Gurupadaswamy showed certain documents which did not contain . *inter-alia* Bofors' supply of guns and other things, but if you examine these things j you will find that it has mentioned *interalia* invoice number under which such deliveries were made on account of which 1 commission was paid. Examination of those j invoices will reveal the truth. Hut pendin.' i examination of such invoices 1 want to j put a question in the context of what Mr. Salve bas slated: Whelher Bofors had supplied to India any other material not connected with that gun-deal to the Defence Ministry and whether in such a deal payment of commission was allowed by the Government of India? I want to know this because we have been told so lone that since 1984 the payment of commission in the defence deal or Whatever material that is supplied on account of the supplies has been eliminated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAl): But if the contract was before 1984?

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH. So. naturally Mr. Salve's argument could not prove that there was no commission.

Now Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the ques tion is why commission was given? Even the Prime Minister has stated earlier and in the interview also that no Indian was involved So. why was the commission paid? If must have been either to influence ihe buyer lo secure the order. Why commission is p.lid by a supplier?

SHRl P, SHIV SHANKER: No: necessarily.

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH; Not necessarily. You know better. You ace a lawyer. All right, let me explain.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : The PM has made clear on that.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; O.K. Not necessarily I quote the word 'not necessarily'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRJ JAGESH DESAI): Sometimes we do not know whether the, equipment is available or not. That is why the commission agents will go to the marke! and find out.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I order to 6ell certain things in competition with othci sellers I am to give commission to somebody who will act on my behalf to secun? the orders or to facilitate the sale of *my* goods, my commodities at a price which is more than the competitive price.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Sometimes even buyers also give commission. We do not know whether the commodity is available of not.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; But what the JPC has stated? JPC hud come to a cate gorical conclusion that no commission was paid but it was winding up charges. It was not Paid to influence the buyers. Is it so?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI. Not to influence the deeisioa-making.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The JPC had stated that it was winding up charges and it was not connected with the inJluencins of these things, it did not influence the order, ii was the best buy and it was the best price. Let me see what our Prime Minister has stated to the "Sunday" maga zine. When a specific question was asked. he said. 1 quote:

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

"To the best of my knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process".

But the JPC's investigation report is a conclusive fact...

THE VICH-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI). What is the date of issue of "Sunday" magazine?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH- The magazine's date is 13—19 November, 1988. The interview was given on the 28th and tne 29th October, 1988 to this magazine.

So, Mr. Panigrahi, during the lastsesskm we were told that the .IPC has done ;: splendid }ob and with ihe conclusion ol the JPC report everything is clear and everything is set right. When the IPO conclusion was it was winding up charges, it hud nothing to do with the securing of orders, etc. etc., influencing the decisionmaking process and JPC had taken as lily-white (ruth what the Bofors repiesentatives have stated to them, to change tyres *etc*.. Win Chadha was paid so much money. But it ijj the Prime Minister who still said "To the best of my knoldege." What docs it mean'* Still he has a doubt in his mind. Even JPC has quoted. .

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI; You are reading it out of the contc\t. You read the whole thing. You are re.idng just one sentence.

"*SHR1 DIPEN GHOSH: It is not out of context. I am quoting the question and he is replying. You have pot read the interview Tha! is my misfortune

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Every line you are quoting. I am noting down whether you are quoting or misquoting, everything.

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH-. Then. T am quoting a, little earlier. "If our assessment is that wc got a good price, then, we really need to chasc only the fact whether an Indian has made money or whether money bas been "sed fo influence the decision making which would be too very serious thing" N> w hie reply 'To the best of my knowledge i< was not paid to influence the decision-making process."

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Dipen Babu, you are such a reasonable and good hon. Member, may I teli \ou?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Even for a good discussion, it is belter if that point is made clear.

SHRl DIPFN GHOSH. No. m». He will speak inter. Naturally when oie has got some doubt in his mind he sayv wi h that clause, if ihe Prime Minister himself could not take the JPCs report aft wholly accent-iWe. . . *(Interruption)*. . .

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: far. VIce-CoHiraan, I may brinjf,. *(fulcmipiif'n)*

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am not yieU ing. Another sentence fei the same paragraph, and I quote:

"So fs»r we have not been able to establish .'..."

That means, stiil the situation ls there which warrants further investigation', *(Inlemiption* )

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAH: Mr, Dipen Ghosh, <*m* also give certificate where we always write "fo the best of my knowledge". *(Inter* ruption)* .

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: T do not know why he is stretching it so far. Sir, you read the whole thing. *(ln/rrnt/-/ion)*

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You arc opposing the enquiry proposed by Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRT CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI.- Whenever you say anything. . *(Interrupti(in)* . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Ghosh, be jwt and fair.

SHRT DIPEN GHOSH: Al) rieht. That is why. T say. . *(Interruption).*

I

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI fMaharasb-*'in):* Sir, I am on a poinl ol order. I would request you that »[n] the present de-• bat* he is quoting from some magazine. 'Ji is for the Government to say yes or no.But, Sir, I would beg of you that theChair should not call for the magazine. 'fc St. worthless. ( *Interruption).* Sir. I 'betJ of you. the convention is the Chair •should not give credit to a magazine which 3ny. Member may be holding. Tt is bih'e for him not for us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KGESH DESAI): t do not give. I wanted to find out the content. . . *{inter-rupiln<).* . .

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, you are an umpire. It is not necessary for you to So into the details.

THF. VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): All right.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Why I am quo'irtg? I am quoting from his interview lo carry home the argument 1hat stiil the situtation as obtaining today, reques further indepth investigation. When the Prime Minister himself takes recourse to such specious cliche, such clauses, no-responsibility clauses; "to the best of my knowledge.. .so far[T]the truth Sias not been established or this has not been established" what does it mean?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: The Government has said, the CBI is looking into it. Therefore the Prime Minister had to say it.

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Panigrahi, that reply has been given by Mr. Pant. Even after that he says it.

Now. Sir, another point. During the last Session. Mr. Arun Singh had slated and you know. Mr. Salve has again com-troverted IH's statement. Mr. Arun Singh wauled either to ask Bofors to pay back the money or to blacklist it and the question is, when it has; been proved that the commission has been paid. violating ihe agreement because the agreement as that uo commission would be paid ytjt, Bofors had paid commission. It has been proved. The Prime Minister himself has admitted. Even he admitted that he had to accept the political beating. While defending not to blacklist, not to cancel the contract, not to ask to pay back tha money, in his ow[n] argument^ he has said, "in the interest of the defence of these things and those things.-" because he said I accept the poli'ical beating. What does it mean ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : But you say what you want now.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : That means Bofors had paid the commission contravening the Government's agreement and it also means that the Prime Minister. Ihe Defence Minister »nd every other Minisler, who spoke on thi[s] during the last debate had suppressed the truth, had misled the House. This is my charge against the Prime Minister. *(Interruption)...*

(SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : It is completely wrong

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH . When he had said that no commission was paid, he had verified it, he had authenticated it from Olof Palme. He brought llof Palme's name to appear here also. Now, he says, yes, it was theirs. At this stage of...(;[n]*-terrtiptions).*

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY : Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, the Prime Minister's interview has been distorted. *(.Interrup-1'tms).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I[t] all depends on what type of information it was and at what point of time. Provided it is proved .. *(Interruptions).*

SHRr DEBA PRASAD RAY : Let him reaj out the portion from the inter\iew itself a[s] to wha' the Prime Minister ha« said on the is>-ue of asking Bofors- to r»y back the money

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) . M[r] Ray, Mr Anand Sharma is there to speak next. Other

[Shri Jagesh Desai]

Members ye also there. They will take s'are of it. *(Intemiptions),*

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH : Mr. Vice-Chair, man, I make this point for you. At a given noint of time, one speak something. But MIICC *ihen the Government* ha? not *yet* come out with such a statement as to say that on $s_0$ and so dates such and such t"lings happened. These were stated in the background Of whatever information thes had got. But they had stated it as the absolute truth They stated it *im* if they were speaking the absolute truth. Even the Joint PUJliamentary Committee had spoken *in that* ss-nse as though that is the absolute tru'b. The Joint Parliamentary Committee had stated that there was no commission but or|ly winding-up charges. Now \fr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Salve has stated. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : You forget about Mr. S.tlvc. Make jour point.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : Why should ( forget Mr Salve ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) . You have already taken 28 minutes That $i_s$ why.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : The question was another, whether we should ask Bofors to pay back the money Mr. Salve said. "No". Again I quote. Mt*. Panigrahi, from Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's interview.

"There is 'he option about asking for ihe money back. That is stiil open."

When the Prime Minister says that the option is still open to ff^k for the money back, Mr. Salve savs 'no'.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAl) : He may give his own opinion.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH : He may say so. My question is, Will the Government tell in when, after which type of investigation, the Government i\ going to ask Bofors to jvy th: money back •> Even if T do not say that Ihe contract has to be nullified.

the Prime Minisler $ha_s$ said that Ihe option $t_0$ ask Bofors to pay the money back is still open. So, naturally, we are entitled to know the answer because it is the country's money, it is the people's money. Nobody should $b_e$ allowed to swindle the people's money. So, when *fa* the Government ^oing 10 ask Bo>Jrs to pay the money back? I know wh.it Mr, Minister will say.

THI: VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JA-(il SH DESAI) ; Please do not assume.

SHRI DIPFN GHOSH : 1 am not assuming, Mr. Pant has stated last time in this I Kms; tlvit the C.B.T. has been asked to investigate. In the interview itself it was said that Katre was sent to *Sweden* to talk to their officials there. And he tes admitted that the C.B.I, investigation fe going on. *(Interruption).* But. pending tho C.i!! investigation—C.B.I, is supplementary force io help him—another impartial Joint Parliamentaiy Committee probe can be done Why I am saying this is—he is laughing—*(Interruptions').* Further disclosures of documents. . .*(Interruptiom).*

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : No new disclosure has been made.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH; Including the disclosures made in the in'erview given by the Prime Minister to the 'Sunday' maga-M/s been proved. . *(Interrup-ilnns) that* the J.P.C. could not deliver the goods. The JPC repor! could not go near the truth. The fact that the Governmsnt says, Mr Panigrahi says, the Prime .Minister himself says, that ihe CBI is investigating it afiesh proves that the JPC headed by Mr. Shankaranand has failed, lifts miserably failed, to go near the truth. So my demand is this. Last time also 1 made this . Tho CBI may have an independent method of investigation. But the CBl as sarin is not independent of the Government Therefore, let there be a Join Parliamentary Committee headed by an Opposition Member and let that Committee be asked to gel Lit the truth. This is neecssary because Mr. Salve was saying atout Mr. V. P Singh. I am not holding a brief for Mr. V. P. Singh. Mr. V. P-Singh made certain charges and obviously those charges have to be proved. It enjoins upon the person making those charges to-

authenticate, to affirm, those charges. When cerain charges arc being made against a high per-on in a high place a dignitary, an important person in Goverment, (he Prime Minisler himhelf here, it enjoins upon the p.rson making those ehaigcs to prove tho charges beyond doubt. Similarly the person who is in a high place and against whom a charge is made, is also expected to prove himself innocent beyond doubt.. .

THF. VICH-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : How can it be ? Supposing somebody says this account is yours, liow can you prove. . .

SHRl DIPEN GHOSH : lt depends on the person against whom the charge is made. That is why the account number has been given. Let the Government come out with the truth in whose name the account stands You have an agreement wi:h tho Swis, Government. Under that agreement, in order to dispel every doubt, in order to prove that ihe Opposition leaders were wrong, let the Government take upon itself the respor Ability of telling the nation that so-and-so account number is in the name cf so ind-so person or so-and-$s_0$ firm, so that the people will understand, will come to thati this was wrong Until and ante < the Government cornes out with this in'omiation, the people will continue say-in, that there is somethin$_e$ wrong in tha w':n«e deal. That is why I say the respon-sMfty lies with the Governmen'. *Lot* there be a Joint Parliamentary probe: let the Government come ou$_r$ with further informa $^f$.JOn abimt that account number. Thank *W.*

r.HRI ANAND SHARMA : Mr. Vice-Ct irman, it is indeed unfortunate that for th third lime this year this august House is once a$_s$j,ain discussing a subject which h? been discussed earlier and ihe pos$^{tion}$ of the Government, the truth of the matter has been amply made clear. There has be.-T nothing new in the intervening period wH:h could have justified this present disjussion. Mr. *Dipen Ghosh, who* was speking just before me and who has now lef$^f$ the House, has once again gone in for $_a$ motivated campaign along with his other coHeaEUes in the Opposition to keep the controversy alive, the only objective, the on'" motiv; of the charges, baseless accusations, which have been made in the newspapers and denied later, the preva;ieations Mr. V P. Singh, a person with a fickle mind who cornes up* with astonishing infoimation from his electronic memorv.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H HANUMANTHAPPA) ia tho Chair].]

But within 48 hours the electronic memory changes. The account number changes and the holder of the account also changes. And that information which, according to the accuser himself, is not new but happens to be what was discussed last time in this House; the document published by the Hindu newspaper, published along with the JPC Report to affect the credibility of the JPC which had genuinely made sincere efforts on the basis of the all available information to ascertain the truth to find out the identity of t'ne recipients and to inform the people about what the reality was.

Sir, I am very sorry to say that the Opposition today on one hand charges the Government with hiding the truth, bu! when it charges the Government of corrupt practices, it also demands that a fresh JPC be constituted headed by the Opposition. I start from here. What moral right do they have to demand a fresh JPC, and that also by saying that il should be headed by them? Do you mean "t^ suggest that all The Members sitting on this side, whether fn Rajj',, Sabha or in Lok Sabh$_a$ aie unreliable you are questioning ou,- integrity? You are questioning ou$_r$ attempts to unearth the truth? You are trjing to give yourself a certificate. But y$^{ou}$ $^a$re also trying to castiga'c us. I strongly object to this, S$^{i}$r.

Sir ihe Government and w$_e$ are all more concerned than they iu find out what actually happened because it i$_s$ in their interest that the truth docs not come out. It is in our interest that this con'roversy ends once for all. Sir, thes$_e$ friends are showing so much of enthusiasm and also creating an erroneous impression that they genuinely want to find out what h.is happened.

Sir, if we <JO by the sequence of events, right from 17th April, 1987 till date, ihe sequence wiil be that always it has been

[Shri Anand Sharma]

the Government and the Prime Minister who have made every possible effort to get at the truth. Six, -when the Swedish Radio came ou* with the story, it was the Government which brought the issue before Parlianien[1]". J; was again the Government of India—Ihe Prime Minister, ^es; his statements have been referred to. The Prime Minister had said: We will nol spare anybody, we wil! punish the guilty. Yes. Sir. The Government had also said initially that the middlemen were not there. What is wrong with the statement? The Prime Minister had only stated that the Government took a conscious decision to exclude middlemen, lt was the first time that this decision \\a$_s$ taken. Had there been no such decision to exclude the middlemen or commission agents, then where was the controversy? And then he said that a guarantee was given. This was corroborated by the Swedish Government. It is not only late Olof Palme but even the present Swedish Government. The present Prime Minister of Sweden has also said: 7es, thi$_s$ understanding was arrived at between the Gov-rnment of lndia and the Governmen; of Sweden. The Under Secre-taiy of Trade who recorded the minutes of the meetings has also said so. So where is the dispute about that? But the Prime Ministe:- also siij on that day—I remember this distinctly—that despite this if there is anything of that sort which has happended, we will not spare anybody**,** and he appealed to the Opposition and appealed to Ihe media, saying: you get us evidence, not the proof, and we shall take action Til] this date.

Sir, between 17th of April 1987 4 P.M, and l5th of November 1988, none of these worthies have come up on Iheir own, neither they nor their leaders, with any evidence which they sometimes claim (hey are in possession of, neither the authors of those stories who haj charged on Ihe Swedish Radio and lr.ter through various newspapers. Sir, it was this Government—I would like to remind you—which impressed upon, which prevailed upon the Governmenit to Sweden to institute an inquiry by the Swedish Audit Bureau, and whatsoever we discussed later JS based tipon th; findings of the SNAB What w: received i$_n$ June was made public, lt was shown io the Opposition leaders, and the Government declared its intention to have a parliamentary inquiry. So the basis of parliamentary inquiry was provided by ihe Government. The *prima facie* case was made out by ;hj Government, with Government eflorts. The credit for finding whatsoever has come out belongs to Rajiv Gandhi and this Government, to nobody else. Sir,, it was a[f] this juncture that the Government invited the Opposition to join the JPC. But they were not interested in finding, out the truth, because they knew what the truth was. They knew that the Government [wa,]> committed to the security interests of the country. They knew that the Prime Minister was above board. It '.^dS a delibera'c campaign, a systematic campaign, for political purposes, ii campaign"¯of disinformation.; and slanders. Sir, I know, when I use strong words, the words J have to use, it is with anguish. But those people who claim that they arc goin., to provide an alternative system, an alternative to the Government, an alternative leadership, utter* What should I call them, if not[5] *(Interruptions)* Sir, when the report of the Audit Bureau came, there were certain. . . *(Interruptions)*

SHRl .ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): * * He can quote, but he cannot use.. .

SHRl ANAND SHARMA; What should 1 call 'hem? Yes, I will call them. ..

SHRl ALADI ARUNA *alius* V. ARUNACHALAM: The same opportunity should b$_c$ given to others also. W$_c$ will also say that the Prime Minister h.i. . .. *(Interruptions-* You must accept thai. He has a lighr to say so if somebody has referred f$_0$ it. But he is alleging. \s is saying, that it is a * It is his opinion, not a reference. ..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA): If ihere is a Jirect allegation. I will look into it.

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: You follow my argument. If he refers to a speech or anything, that is different. But he is charging that it & a' That is his opinion. That is what 1 arti Eaying.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: As I was saying, e\ ei when the SNAB leport was received there were certain portions excised from it—exebed because the Swedish laws, because commercial confidentiality was claimed by the Bofors management. But the Government of India was not satisfied even with thd$_t$ report. The correspondence between *tht* Ministry of Defence and Bofors and the Swedish Government will clearly establish, that the Government of India till thi$_s$ day kept on insisting that the Swedish Government makes available the excised portion^ of the report so that we can get more information. But Sir, on fne basis of the report which was made available, th$_e$ JPC was constituted The Opposition member;, who had themselves demanded the JPC were looking for excuses. If I remember correctly, at their instance even the term, of reference of the JPC were changed. But even then they did not join, for obvious reasons. After that, when the JPC report came out, it is clear, they are virtually castigating the JPC. And I object to this, because they are esteemed members of Indian Parliament, of both these Houses. Thej' are my colleagues here. They have made efforts. They have worked hard. You look at their report. Even about these accounts which they are referring to or about which there i$_s$ a reference in the Hindu documents, there i$_s$ a reference in the JPC report. Even the total amount and the accounts have been referred to. When they talk of winding-up charges, this is not something which we have coined. This is not something which we speak about. This is something which has been said by the Swedish National Audit Bureau. A certificate to this effect has been given by their Public Acountant. Tt is all there in the JPC report. T need not quote the excerpts which have been discussed in the past. But the Government of lndia has never accepted this position.

Tber$_e$ is one aspect about the weapon system we purchased, whether the weapon system was purchased at a higher cost, whether we have lost our money and whether the so-called commissions or winding-up charges o$_r$ termination costs claimed by Bofors or Swedish National Audit Bureau hav$_e$ influenced the contract. Now, this is the crux of the matter. If my memory serves me right, it was in 1984 when the Defence authorities submitted their requirement along with the prices quoted by various companies to the C.C.P.A. The price which was approved in 1984 was Rs. 1600 crores. In 1986, the contract was signed for Rs. 200 crores less. Given the fluctuations of currency, one can only say, if one has to be honest, that the Government should be given credit for ensuring such a stiff competitive or for generating that competition to ensure competitive prices for us. If the money which is referred to has not gone from us, then what the supplier actually does with the profits *n* his business lt i> none of our business. This is ont aspect. They quote the Prime Minister out of context. Mr. Dipen Ghoshi was saying that the P.M. has said this in the enterview. P.M. has admitted. Now, it was a hypothetical observa'ion of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has said that to the best of his knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process He has also said that so far we have not been able to esta-Wish whether money has been given to any Indian. Now, tht investigation is still continuing. The C.B.I, approached the Swiss Government. We got two things going with Ihe Swedish Governments. We vtar'ed talking to them of $_a$ treaty. What this means is that he CBI i$_s$ investigating as was assured bv the Government. During the last debate when document^ were brought up by the Hindu We had said tha' the CBI wo'jld look into it. In addition to that, the Government has taken another ster*. As per *j* the Prime Minister, the Government has 1 been negotiating with the Swedish Govern-1 ment a treaty so that more information I »« made available to us. Here they are once again bringing it up and distorting

*Expunsed r.s ordered by the Chair.

[Shri Anand Sharma]

even what the Prime Minister has said. I take strong objection to another remark by Mr. Dipen Ghosh when he said about the Prime Minister admitting that 'I am willing to take a beating, I am willing to take a beating'. Eithe$_r$ he does not understand the English language or he is being deliberately mischievous and malicious. *(Interruptions)* He knows it. He knows what th$_e$ Prime Minister has said. He has said that if we go ... .*(Interruptions) 1* will quote what he ha$_s$ said. He has said that there are demands of cancellation of contract. There are demands of penalising Bofors. My memory is fortunately good and I can quote him from memory. It wil] quote it. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please allow him to continue.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: That is what he says and that is what the truth is. There are certain provisions in any contract, particularly a contract of this magnitude, of this importance that when you arbitiarily cancel a contract, you have to pay penalty. A particular percentage of contract you have to pay as compensation to the other party. In addition to that. Sir, you have to start the whole exercise afresh, >ou have to invite fresh tenders, you have to locate the possible suppliers, and then enter into negotiations. So, on the one hand, you deprive the Indian Army and the nation of this weapon system for another couple of years; last time, it took nine long years to clinch this particular deal; God alone knows what international interests may crop up which may prevent India from acquiring the weapon system. ln addi'ion to that. Sir. we are bound to pay more. Tf w$_e$ buy something in 1990, we are bound to pay much more. So, the Prime Minister has said that it i; better that T take the political beating liecause of this motivated campaign of lie$_s$ and slander rather than the nation getting a beating where the Army does not have the weapon which it badly needs. You should salute the ,$^J$rime Minister for making that remark tian accusing him. What is wrong? I am proud of a Prime Minister who says thai I can take the beating but I will not al'ow India to take the beating because he is a patriot, he is a nationalist. And here I would like to say, Sir, that it is tragic that this House has to discuss for the fifth time this matter. Can we allow these Hou ies of Indian Parliament or this august House to be-come an instrument of political slander? Can we allow political campaigns or election manifestoes to evolve out of these discussions? Those people who ire directionless, who lack manifestos, who Hack programme of action, they are sticking to it like their Bible because the present exercise of Mr. V. P. Singh has teen described by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Salve, before me.. *(Interruptions)* I im no: referring to the details of those documents. But if you want, I can educate you. Those documents were the same which I referred to in the last debate. You read my list speech. I do not want to waste the time on that. They were published by the 'Hindu'. V. P. Singh has contradicted himself. On 5th November, he says, this is the Lotus account number, and of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He should hang his head in shame for saying that because on 7th of November at Lucknow, the same gentleman comes up with another statement that these ure the documents which were published by the 'Hindu', and that this is Svenska account and not Lotus account. Today, in Parliament, when he is asked to own it up, he runs away from that. What is the character of that individual? *(Interruptions)* To whom he is teaching morals? *(Interruptions)*

**श्री राम नरेश यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अगर यही बात थी तो प्रधान मंत्री को यहां पर लाना चाहिए था . . . (व्यवधान) . . .**

SHRI ANAND SHARMA; Sir, Mr. V. P Singh i$_s$ very fond of talking in crores. He has declared his personal assets. This Fakir of Janata Dal o- Jan Morcha has declared his personal a;set$_s$ of Rs. 7 crores. Thos$_e$ are the imrrovable assets. How many movable assets are there? If

I have to be that irresponsible as these people, if I say that this particular account he had, haw can you deny? *(Interrup-tions)* But that is not their plea. *{Interrup.ions).* Sir, what I am only trying to say is that India is a great country. India has been respected for it traditions, fo rils culture, for its us'.oms. India today is witnessing a scenario where power-!:'Jngry people who have been repeatedly rejected by the India masses because of their greed, because of their lust of power, boca'.iss of the fac that they do not have any substance in them, they are resorting to one of the ugliest campaigns to destroy established institutions. When I say institutions, Sir, the Prime Minister of India is an institution. It is after great struggle, great sacrifices that we built up these institutions, the institutions which are an integral part of Parliamentary democracy. These institutions must not be allowed to be destroyed overnight, this is my submission, and for the Opposition, it will do you a lot of good, if you do some self-introspection. *(Time bell rings)* Nothing prevented them or their so-called confidential sources, electronic sources elsewhere to place this information either before the JPC or before this Parliament, or V. P. Singh could have done today in the Lok Sabha or their patrons could have done before tru Swedish mrthoriti^ Whatsoever they have s?id, it is a lie and thev must be condemned for it and certainly thw al! are rot qualified to question the credibility of a Prime Minister who is the custodians of a great culture of the Indian Naional Congress and the legacy of the Nehrus. T repeat myself and I have said it earlier that this is the family which is known and respected for its contribution and sacrifices and this Prime Minister today be lives for this country frorfT moment to moment, from the day he has accepted this responsibility. It is shameful that a leader who loves his nation, even his love for the country is being questioned by these who have yet fo prove their own ere-dentials and that they do not have extraterritorial loyalties. Thank you.

SHRl PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I may not agree with all the lavish praise myfriend. Mr. Anand Sharma, showered on his boss and the leader. But .. *.(Interruptions).* If you disturb me, I will have to use harsh words. But I must say one thing that the conscience of the Prime Minister has started pricking him at last and in his search for self-revelation, statements nearer the truth have started coming out of his mouth. The BangaJore statement was one of them'. Because from his stand that there was no middler.-".i a: all, from his stand that nothing was paid, tlien from his stand that even if something was paid it was only a winding up charge, to admit that a commission has been paid and he never denied payment of the commission, is a great progress. But the only 'hir.g is that while he made a categorical statement in Bangalore on November 10, tha; he never denied payment of commissions, his Government spokesman issued a statement next day, that PM did not mean it. And even the denial had no sJ'nss because it was neither categorical nor it covers up the Prime Minister's statement. It was a bland denial. Probably the country would have taken the denial but for a very elaborate interview given by the Prime Minister to Sunday, in which he justified payment of the Commission, if it is for a genuine purpose. Therefore there is a contradiction again it is the Government's stand on the same. And I need not mention about the stands taken by his Ministers. One Minister who was honest enough to stand by hi, statement had to resign because he told the Parliament that nothing was paid and there was no middleman and when he found tha' there was a middleman and something was paid, he honourably q-1 it. So, I only wish that Mr. Chintamani Panigrahi, who is another good man, wi!' not make such wrong statements and will not face the same consequences. And the Defence Minister asserted in this House and taunted the Opposition also for mak'ns

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: You are misquoting the whole thing.

SHRI PARVATHANENl UPENDRA.: . . irresponsible statements- that pavm;nts have been made. And Mr. Shiv Shanker had a very elaborate argument how tha money flowed back to the directors of the Bofor sthemselves. Therefore, there were

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

contradictory statements from the Ministers themselves- And m the Parliament itseit, the Prime Minister also, in the earher stages, made such varied statements. He said one thing to army commanders; he said something else about the Swed.sh Prime Minister's assertions, and subsequently changed the same statement He has been shifting his stand very often Even when he met opposition leaders," he aid something in that meeting." But the question is, today he justifies payment ol commission if it is genuine. At the same time he forgets that according to agreement, any payment of commission is prohibited, whether it is for genuine purpose or bogus purpose. On what basis can he justify that for genuine purpose, the commission can be paid? Where was it written? When the agreement specifically prohibit^ employment of middlemen and payment of commission or any charges, how can he justify today that if it is for genuine purpose, it can be done. This itself is wrong. And who judges whether it is for genuine purpose or not. That is why I want to say, in this strip-tease act which the Government is performing, only the under-garments remain now and the day is not far off when the naked truth will come out.

And if the Prime Minister knew that commission was paid, according to him for genuine purposes, why was this fact not made known to the JPC? It is not today only; these documents came out much earlier, even before the JPC submitted its report, and the Prime Minister must have known about them. When he knew that payment was made, and if he was convinced that it was for genuine purpose ,why was it not made known to JPC and why was he stiil justifying and telling all these months that no payments were made? If it was for genuine purpose, why could he not justify it earlier? That itself shows that having failed in all attempts to cover up the truth, and when things started coming out, even including bank account numbers etc., he takes the alibi that if it is for genuine purpose it can be paid. That is very wrong. And even about Bofors whom he justifies in his interview tint agreement cannot de cancelled, legally t is not permissible, or military-wise it u undesirable, he forgets to what extent Bofors went in misleading the Parliament and misleading the Parliamentary Committee and everybody. I will only quote one or two sentences as an illustration. JPC said finally in its report: "There i:i no evidence to show that any middleman was involved in the process of acquisiiior of Bofors guns. There is also no evidence to sub-stantiate the allegation of commibion oi bribe having been paid to anyone. Therefore, the question of payment to any lndian Or Indian company, whether resident in India or not does not arise, esps-cially when no evidence to the contrary is forthcoming from any quarter." This is what JPC report says on page 191. Then I quote from page 111 of the JPC report on Bofors dated 15th May 1987, A. B. Bofors stated, interalia, 'The contract signed by the Indian Minister of Defence with A. B. Bofors on March 24, 1986, contains no clause concerning payment of commission. Neither does there exist anj contract with lndia, neither between Indian Government uor any other Indian party and A. B. Bofors to provide for payment of commission n connection with winning the said contrsct. The allegation on Swedish Radio on May 13, 1987 that A. B. Bofors informed Swedish Central Bank that payment of commission Iu (ndian agents was part of the Indian contract, is entirely wrong.'" That is the Bofors' categorical statement.

Again, when they appeared before the farlhmentarv Committee, th;y repeated the same thing again that no commission had been paid, that they fad not paid anything. This clearly shows that Bofors hatl misled the Government, misled the Parliamentary Committee ,ind this is enough reason to go in for cancellation of the contract and ask for damages. 1 *do* not know why the Government is not faking recourse to this step The Prime Minister and the Government have to explain.

My friend. Mr. Anant] harma, said that Upposition has not been abe to produce evwnce. What more evidence >ou ueed? The Government agrees, the Bofors company agrees, the Joint Parliamentary Committee agrees, that Rs. 64 crores have changed hands. Whose duty it is to prove? Today, ih;re is a cloud oi suspicion hanging ove/ ihe head of this country's Government anj accusations are being made repsaieiuy, n.'.mes of banks are given and a.wiu.'t numbers are quoted. Is it not the duly and the respjnsibl/lity of thi Govrnm.-ni to find out where these yxty-four crores of rupees' h--.ve gone? Is it for th; Opposition to Prov:? Is it for the newspapers to prove? Then, what for your investigating agencies are there? What for the Governmen; machinery is there? What for your embassies are there? Is it not >oui duty? When the charge is against you, when tha suspicion is about you, it is your duty to prove that it is not so. Unless you prove it, unless you come out as to who has taken this money, we are perfectly justified, the country is justified, the Press is justified, in making such accusations aaainst anybody in this land. It is for you to p-ove. You are the head of the Government. You have to prove.

Again^ in the interview, he says—it is very strange—'to the best of my knowledge, money has not been used to influence the decision-making process: so far we have nUt been able to establish whether money has cTJfn'e to any Indian'. To the question "did you try hard enough?' he says "We have tried very hard; we have not finished trying.' I do not know what to call this. I do not know call this Government. It is corrupt al! right. But it is such an incompetent Government that it cunnot find out as to whom the money has gone. T give the benefit of doubt to anybody about this matter. I do not want to accuse X or Y. But it is your fundimental duty to find out as to who has taken thic money. If you are not capable of that, you have to faCe this kind of innuendos and you nave to face the music. You cannot say that it is not your dutv to prove the Opposition has to prove, the Press has to prove. You may say so now But one aa»- it will be proved. One day when you will 'be quitting the Government anj some other Government will come to power, everything will te proved, everything will come out and you will have to face ihe consequences then. Tih such time, it is ihe responsbility of the Government, it is your responsbility s to prove that monev has not gone to you but to somebody eise. You have udmitted that money has been pjid. Nobody is denying th.it money has Dcen paid. It is for you to prove and tell us as to where this money has gone. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, until that is done, it will be presumed that commission has been pud to those in high positions. The charge wll remain. We will stand *b)* tie ^hu ge wfc*e-*er is making the chnrge,

•sir, uae Prime Ministej owes an apology to this House for misleading this House iepe ..techy about payment ol commission. Decency ;equiies that the Prime Minister shouid come belore tne House and suy on behalf of the Government that this House has been misled, the other House nas been misled anj that the nation his been mis-Jed. Parliament's sanctity has to be maintained. It is also very strange that some lesponsible Ministers rushed to the Press with their tatements vvihout any information in their possession. I do not appreciate lesponsibie Ministers going te the Press and blandly issuing a statement that it is not correct. If you have facts, you have to come out with thern. Parliament is the forum. You have to come before Parliament and tell us. Simply because Mr. Narasimha Rao or Mr. Shiv Shanker or Mr. Chavan or some other Minister comes out with a statement in ihe Press, the n ition is not going to believe it. Today, even a small child does no' believe the P'ime Minister. We know what children are saying on the radio and television. Therefore, do not try to fool the people. The people are not going to be foiled by you. The successive elections have proved this. They have proved what the people are thinking about you. Tne comina election.; will also nrove what the peonle think nhoiu you. One responsible Minister even invents n bank account 0f Mr V. P. Sinsh. He also invents a name, saying 'universe*

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

means "Vishwanath" He gives a code number.

SHRl P. SHIV SHANKER: Can you say that Mr. V. P. Singh has not invented?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You are the Government. Please come out with proof if you have anything against Mr. V. P. Singh. You have got th-; machinery. You prove it.

SHRl DARBARA SINGH: Mr. V. P. Singh has not come out with any proof. He has only m'.ide allegations.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Darbara Singh, you are a responsible person. It is for the Government to prove. You are the Government. If Shri V. P. Singh has an illegal account, you arrest him, produce the evidence and atrest him. Have you got the guts t° do that? You do that. Who prevents you? Would you have kept quiet if you had the evidence in your hands? And Mr. Sathe is going to the press, saying that it is V. P's. account. It is n°t fair. He makes a frivolous charge. It is highly objectionable. *(Interruptions) ,*

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman^ I only conclude by telling that we have talked enough on this. The truth will ultimately come out. Nobody can suppress the truth for ever. Their days are numbered. And when thei,-days are numbered, when 'heir turn cornes, when they are thrown out, definitely the truth will come out. And when the truth cornes out all these people, incuding their leader will have to face the consequences.

With these words I say that at least now the Prime Minister owes an apology to the House, it is his fundamental duty to come to the House and apologise for all the misleading statements he has made so far.

SHRIMATl JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mt. Vioe-i.ihajrman sir, I thought that the most shameful day in the history of parliament occurred during the last session when my colleagues from the other side invaded the floor of the House and even came on this side of the House and made threatening gestures to the Chairman and refused to allow the proceedings of the House to continue. Now I find that if that was not the most shameful day in the history of Parliament it is probably today when once again we have taken up what has come out in the Press and spent hours and hours on thi* debate.

I do not want to go into the merits of the statement. Much has been said about the meriijs of! the statement, much has been said about Bofors, so much hus already been spoken by various speakers who spoke before me, but if you go hack into the history of this when the first allegation came and after it was denied strenuously> the loudest cries and the loudest pleas came from t'ne Opposition for formation of a Joint Parliamentary Committee to go into the issue. When it was found after the audit Bureau.s report thai somehing haj transpired and when Government came forward in all earnestness to gel at the truth of the matter, the Government begged and pleaded with the opposition lo Join us in a Joint Parliament-ary Cmmittee it was the same opposition Members who decibed to boycott the Committee. At hat time if they were really interested in getting at the truth of the matter, they should have joined the Joint Parliamentary Committee. It was their solemn duty t0 join the JPC, but at that time they raised all kinds of trivial issues, all kinds of issues about who should be the Chairman about whether the Minister should be allowed to appead before the Committee. They raised every single procedural hurdel and refused to join even before the Committee was constituted. The Committee spent hours anj hours of time going into every detail of the matter.If anyone of them had been present on that Committee.nothing could have prevented them form asking all the right questions form the persons who appeared before the Committee to get at the truth, but it was never their intention to get at the truth. After the Committee came out with its finding there was an end to the matter.

But then we came across once again during the last session documents Published by the *Hindu* and today and yesterday we find in the newspapers once again these statements by Mr. V.P. Singh which are an exact reproduction of what had appeared in the Hindu except Mr. V.P. Singh had never understood what the Hindu itself has said and has deliberately confused himself. He has tried to mislead the entire nation by giving a totally distorted picture oj what actually happened. Without going into what he has actually said I would only like to say one thing. As a member of the JPC_ when going through every single document that was placed before the Committee I found one thing. Mr. V. P. Singh was at that time the Finance Minister Every single document every part of the negotiation was before Mr. V. P. Singh. It was Mr. V. P- Singh who signed each and every document even before it went to the Prime Minister who was then Defence Minister, lt was the finance Minister that cleared every part of the deal, every bit of the negotiation and it was only after the clearance of the Finance Minister and 'he signature of Shri V. P. Singh that everything came up before the Prime Minister who was also the Defence Minister at that time. If something was wrong, it is very strange that the man who actually signed every document, "he man who was actually party to the deal has gone back on everything. He has not explained till today. Ho$_w$ it was that when he singed every single document in this deal, as Finance Ministe,- he lakes no responsibility for that? And then he stveaks with another vi"-, today, coming out and saying that ti:, vvhole deal was shady, that money has passed hands, that commissions have passed hands. I do not want to follow the example of my colleagues who have spoken before me I do not want to give newspaper and magazine reports un-necessary status by quoting them in this House. But taking what has been said by Mr. Upendra and Mr. Dipen Ghosh about what the Prim*- Minister has said—and they have criticised what the Prime Minister has said, when he said "to the best of my knowledge"—Sir, they have given Iheir interpretation of what the Prime Ministe$_r$ has said, but according to my inter. pretation, when the Prime Minister says, "to the best of my knowledge" he probably means that Mr- v- p- Singh should know it because he was the Finance M.nister at that time and *If* any commission had been paid ■$_a$*ud* it anything had been done, he *it* the person who should be knowing, he is the person who should know the sources of bank accounts, which also makes Mr. Sathe's statement absolutely correct that he has a bank account which is called "Vishwa".

We have been talking so much in the last Session about the onus of proof. We have been talking so much about the Defamation Bill where everybody was screaming from the other side how it is for the prosecutor to take the onus of proof. Now how is it that responsible Members of the Opposition—so called— get up and make these wild and baseless allegations against the Prime Minister repeatedly without any regard for truth?

Sir, what happened in the other House this morning is painful evidence of the fact that this is an Opposition which is totally bereft of issues. I plead, with the Opposition, if they want to go *to* the people with issues, let us take the serious issues of the people. Let them challenge the Government over these issues. Let them take the issue of floods, let them take th$_e$ issue of hunger, let them take the issue of rising prices, for instance. Let them take all these issues and let us debate them. Let the time of thi$_s$ House be used to debate issues which are of crucial importance to the people. It is not as if corruption is not an issue. But this particular debate has gone on for such a long time. We have talked about it to the extent that the entire country came to another sad point in its history when the Prime Minister, because of all the forces of destabilisation that had launched together against him, had to get up in Parliament and in the in'erest of probity and decency in public life, make a solemn statement that he was in no way involved with corruption, that no member of his

([Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan]

family was involved m any kind of deal. And to tbis day, nooody has vcci cum: up with a scrap ol' ev.denee that eouid possio.y connect the Pfliras Miniter. On the other hand, in the other House today Mr. V.P. Singh was challenged--thi$_s$ is the entire basis of the debate on which all of us are talking—ana a^ked to get up and authenticate what he had said, and he was unanle to do it. He was sitting in the House. He was unable to do it. He went away from the House. *(Interruptions)* He was not able to do it, I reiterate it. He sat there in silence, *(tmetruptions)* You can quote newspaper reports and 1 can quote what happened in the other House. He got up and went away. He was unable to do it.

Sir, this is the man. lt you go back, you are talking about ceratin charges that newspapers for their own reasons have carried and given such extensive coverage. Who is the person who made these charges? This is the person. H$_e$ was Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh and the moment things started going wrong there when the dacoit problem took over he resigned and ran away. This is the person who became a Member of Parliament in 1971 and after he became a Minister in 1975, he started amassing huge wealth. Even according to his own admission, he has flats and commercial complexes in Barakhamba Road. he has commercial complexes in Nehru Place, he has a huge farm in Mehrauli, he has a commercial complex in Kailash, he has vast amounts of money. This is the person. Thi$_s$ is the person whose son became a non-resident Indian...

†† उर्जा मंत्रालय में विद्युत विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री कल्पनाथ राय): ** ... (व्यवधान) ।

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA (Karnataka): Sir on a point of order.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN- I am not yielding. I am not yielding.

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Can a Minister call a Member **when he is not a Memher of this House? He is a Minister. He must have some sense of propoition. He should withdraw it or it should be removed from the records.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He is a**.. .*(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Maheswarappa, please sit down.

*श्री. सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : राजीव गांधी** है. . . (व्यवधान) ।

SHRl K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Then everyone can call anybody anything. . .. *(Inteiruptions)* ... The Minister is calling an honourable Member, our Party President, a ** Will you allow it to go on K-eord? What *U* this? . ..(*Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I seek your protection; I do not want to be interrupted.

SHRI K. G. MAHESWARAPPA: Your own Minister is interrupting you. You have got such Ministers i$^n$ the Cabinet.

AN HON. MEMBER: All ** , *'(Interruptions) ...*

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Vice-Chairmnn, on a point of order. Apart from the fact that language in Parliament has to b$_e$ temperate—on both sides; I am not referring to anyone—in this particular cas$_{e\ a}$ relevant point of order is: Can a Member of the other House in any way be described with abusive epithets of this kind? It is highly improper and, therefore, at least so far a$_s$ the other House is concerned, we should be very scrupulous in seeing that no reference is made to any particular Member. . . . *(Interruptions)* .. . Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am on a limited point, and that limited point i$_s$ that Mr. V. P. Singh is today an honourable Member of the other House. Let not any of us

††Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

m:-ke any abusive references to an honourable Member of the other Hous;, lt is totally opposed to all parliamentary practice. 1 would request yon to . vpunge those remarks. . . . *(Intemiptions).* .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Minister, I actuaPy agree wi!h Mr. Advani—a Member of the other House should not be accused. Here we are in a special situation whe G ihe entire discussion darted on certain a'!e?ritions of a particular Member. In spite of that, I request the Members of both the sides to use... *(Inteiruptions).* . .

ARUNA V ARUNACHALAM: Why are you allowing it? He has no right to use such words. That *is* the point for considerat'nn. . . *(Interruptions')* He has a right to allege but he has no right use that word. That is more important.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): And you have forgotten what Mr. V. P. Singh has *said. . .(Interruptions)* . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I won't uae abusive epithets: I am only going to state facts. . *(Interruptions)* .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): When a point of order is raised, it is between the Chair and the Membar., .*(Interruptiom)* Plsase a[1]-low me to complete. When the discussion itself has started on a special circumstance, on the statements made by a certain Member of the other House, naturally his name will be picked up referred to and his references also will be quoted, as also bis earlier references. But I request the Members on both sides to be temperate in their words... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Are you expunging that word?

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Then we call Gandhi *terruptions)* .

SHRl ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: You please tell us whether you have allowed the word or not**,** That is the point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Aladi you can't force the Chair like this, please.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA V. ARUNACHALAM): I am not forcing. I would like to *know(Interrup)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN .SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please sit down. You please allow me to speak,

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): The point is whelher the words used will be kept on record or expunged. .. *(Interruptions)* . .

SHRl RAM AWADHESH SINGH. All right, let it be there: there is no harm. We will call Rajiv Gandhi and everybody**
( *Utiitrnipiiuhs)* . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Ram Awadhesh Singh, one minute you stand up and say it should not be there. Another minute you stand up and say, let it be there.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: You are not giving the correct thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I am going to give but you won't wait till then. I will look into the record and if there are objectionable words I will remove them from the record.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Still you are vague.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): I should know what has gone into the record. Yes, Mrs. Natarajan. Please continue. . -.

---

Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir. I am on a very limited point and 'hat is the only point I wish to make, i may respectfully take from what you already said just now. The entire allegations and the entire debate that i taking place in the House are made on the basis of allegations made by a certain person, a former Finance Minister who was formerly an hon. Member of this Houss. So also we thought. Sir, this is the person, as I was saying who was originally in such a high posit on as the Chief Minister, who then became a Member of Parliament in 1971, who became a Miniser in 1975, and 1 am saying that after becoming a Minister in 1975 amassed huge properties in Delhi.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: Have you any proof? .. *(Interruptions)-*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: You deny it. I am saying it. Let me take the consequences of my statement.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Counter-charges are not answer to the debate.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Let then say. My argument.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): She is not answering. The Government will answer final-
ly.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Why should I answer? It is for me to say what I think about these charges. They ar$_e$ extremely relevant because we are now lookilng at the person who has made charges and the reason why he has made them and rno$_w$ far these charges can be proved I am sorry. I am referring to nobody. If a mad rnan goes on the street and screams charges nobody is going to take them seriously. If a great man gets up and makes these charges, every body i9 going to take him seriously. If a person whom we can prove is a chronic liar and is a person who always misused hi$_s$ authority, is a person who runs away at the first sign of trouble, is a person Who has insatiable lust for power, and in the quest af that lust for power can make any kind of allegations.. . *(.Interruptions)*

Sir, if I can prove that there is a person who has insatiable lust for power and in this lust for power has lost all sense of decency and morality then. Sir, I can show that no statement this person makes can possibly be taken seriously by anybody to be debated on the floor of the House.

Then, I just want to make the last submission, Sir. This was the person who was the Finance Minis'er of India. This was the person who has signed every page of that file. This was the person whose son one month after joining a foreign company in New York bought huge shares of Reliance stock and gave a wrong address as be. ing in London. This is the person who has now started a new—I do not know whether it is a party or whether it is a movement or whether it is a people's movement. This is the person who should look around at his own colleagues. His own relative stands chargesheeted of murder i$_n$ a horrible scandal. He shou(d look at all the other people who surround him in his party.

Then Sir, [ appeal to my colleagues here on the other side of the House, who have taken up the cause of M$^r$- V.P. Singh to clean up their houses first. We have the Bengal Lamp scandal in Calcutta. We have the Rama Rao Karshaka parishad scandal in Andhra Pradesh.

These are the peoplg who are talking about probity in public life; what are we wasting the time of this House for? Let us talk about more serious issues.

Therefore, I say, Sir. that the whole idea, this entire debate has originated with only one idea, and that idea is to gain cheap political mileage out of vitriolic personal attack. It has no basis whatever. Mr. V P. Singh himself has not been able to authenticate it.

I say, Sir, there is an end to the debate. Even earlier if my colleagues on the other side had any intention of getting at the truth, they should have joined the parliamentary Committee at that time. Now ft

dose not lie in their mouth to demand another joint Parliamentary Committee.

It is just for cheap political advantage, and we shou'd not waste the time of the House any longer.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is never easy to fol'low in the wake of the eloquence my charming colleague Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan. She has made my task particularly difficult today, because firstly, she started by terming today's debate as the most shameful in the history of our Parliament. Even at the mildest I would be constrained to observe that that is an uncharacteristically shrill and overstated observation coming as it does from a Member whose interventions we always look forwanl to. It is also difficult for me to follow in her wake because she confined herself *to* examining the personality of a certain Honourable Member of Parliament with whom, I do not suppose, we are cenitrally involved.

My disappointment is only on the ground that there are issues that this question of Bofors payments has raised; and if we continue to debate them, it is only because tho.se issues have yet to be answered even satisfactorily, leave alone ful'y. The pricipal speaker from the treasury benches, hon. N. K. P. Salve, started by saying; "let the issue be resolved". It is an observation, and a sentiment with which I wholly concur. Let the issue of Bofors be finally resolved. We too are weary in our pursuit. We do not delight in this constant exchange of invectives with each other. We also believe that the nation has paid a very high price for Bofors and that price is not to be measured and connot be measured only in terms of dollars or setrinlg or Swedish kroner. This is an assertion made by a number of speakers from the treasury benches that this debate has arisen only because of what a certain Honourable Member of Parliament, belonging to the other House has said. I submit that the only point from where this debate arises or where does the cerntral question lies. That central question, simply put, is that when it was stated that Bofors had made contract related payments, as "commissions', to by now identified parties, of amounts which by now stand established, then how and with wha resoluteness of purpose did our Government clear the air and bring to book the accountable? That is the central question that remains; the question of accountability of the Executive to th© Legislature. And unless that is resolved. I do put it across to all my colleagues, esteemed and otherwise, of the treasury benches that this will not go away.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN; What is otherwise?

AN HON MEMBER. You are not ia that category.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: On an earlier occasion I had said that through a feat of an outstanding piece of journalism, the *Hindu* had published these documents. Shri N. K. P. Salve was good enough to describe the documents as 'stacks of papers', 'not worth the paper on which they are published' etc. Yet other quibbling legal points that he had made about validity of photo-copies etc. He being a Chartered Accountant of eminence, I can neither quibble with him on chartered accuontancy points, nor on the points about the figures that he gave, but I do submit that before this debate started today I had alreadv submitted to the Chairman a set $_0$f 45 documents and I authenticate that set of 45 documents that I have submitted to the Chairman. I stand by those documents and I request that these documents be examined because the questions that these documents have raised are not questions relating to you or to me; they relate to the totality of the functioning of our nation, the totality of governance of moral authority as such. I repeat that. Sir. I have the same set of 45 documents here, which, I with due sense of responsibility as a member of this Parliament authenticate and lay on the Table of the House.

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM (Assam): I am on a point of order. We do not disbelieve the honesty of the hon. Member. He is very honest. But he may be quite

[Shri Baharul Islam]

.innocent of the legal provision. How can he authenticate some documents, the oii-ginai of which is not in his custody? I nut is the pomt. Only an authority which is in custody ol" the original document can authenticate it. I cannot authenti.ate, he cannot authenticate. He may be very ho.icst, but he cannot authemicaic.

SKRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Suppose those who have got the original, if th:-y give a ceitificate, what wll happen then?

SHRI BAHARUL ISLAM: If these documents are the copies of those documents whi.h are Iu. posession of the Swiss Bank, only the authorities of the Swiss Bank can authenticate. Neither V. P. Singh, nor he, nor me can authenticate.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, here again with due respect to my esteemed colleague and a luminary of the Supreme Court, I am not on this small point of what precisely the legal meaning of the word '"authenticate" is. 1 do repeat, I authenticate these documents as a Member of Parliament and I will lay them on the Table of the House.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Mr. Jaswant Singh, under what rule you want to lay them on the Table of the House? *(Interruptions)*. I do not know under what rule he wants to lay them on the Table of the House.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He is interested to get at the truth. It is only to get at the truth, he is laying them on the Table of he House. If you are also interested to get at the truth, you peruse them.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Mr. Dipen Ghosh, if he wants he can give it to the Chairman but he cannot lay it on the Table.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): I agree with the point mad© by my honourable justice sahib that he cannot lay these authenticated or original copies on ihe Table. The most important point on which 1 seek a ruling from you is that whether he can 'by these documcnis on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): He cannot do it.

SHRI JASWANT SINuH: My documents are auLehniicated. They are laid on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); That cannot be done.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The honour-able, Mr. N. K. P. Salve, spok: about ᵀome "front companies" and '"bazaar gos-,i'p". 1 will come to that subsequently, in a brief while, He also .-poke abo^t and that is a matter which was referred to by others as well, the defence of the country, choice of weapons and cance lation costs etc. He was good enough to point out that in one of the invoices what is mentioned is that the commission actually paid is for the L-70 ack-ack gun and not 155 mm Howitzer. Now that is very pertinent, because the invoice reveals more that what we had hoped, he invoice says it is not only in the case of 155 mm Howitzer that commissions have been paid agents were existing but also in the case of L-70 which has been in the use in the Indian Army, as an acK-a:k gun, for long enough time; and for that too commissions have continued to be paid. It really does not solve the problem. In fact, it creates more problems.

Sir, we have moved a long way since the 17th April of 1987. Then, we were informed officially by the Government that the statement put out by the Swedish Radio was "false, misleading and mis-chievousᵀ and that "nothing has been paid to the Swiss Bank". This was stated by the Prime Minister in an Army Commanders' Conference in the month of April, 1987. Again stated by the Prime Minister that it is "not commission when such payments are made. Again stated by the Prime Minister that it is "not paid to

an lndian"' and finally, when doubts arose on thut too that possibly it hud been paid to a!i lndian, the Prime Minister said "it hdi not been paid to an Indian politician." From there we move to the recent Bangalow statement of the hon. Prime Minister. $H_e$ says "We have never denied the payment of commissions". And the Mce.tr interview to a journal where the Prune Minister, indeed hypothetically, puts across a logic that if Bofors paid tht" r *ifims,* hypothetically )speaking, as ""industrial espoinage", then, they cannot be faulted on that account, there is nothing objectionable in that respect. This is a very depressing account of a befuddled and bedraggled Government engaging itself in some unworthy and un-illuminating espionage of its own, an espionage of cover-up that has caused the misleading of the entire nation, misleading of both Houses of Parliament, of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, repeatedly and time and again. That is why this issue keens coming up and until you solve it, it will keep on coming up.

The Pr'me Minister in the other House when Bofors had first surfaced, had said words to the effect that we don't need proof, giva us evidence. In this House he had said "For heaven's sake, show us the direction in which we should look." When this direction is finally shown the hon. Prime Minister, the Treasury Benches and the Government do not only not look, they actually look away and when ^ 00 *PM.* we remind them to look in the direction in which the guilt lies, they turn on us and call us destablilizers. Sir. there $^{ar}e$ $som_e$ overriding impressions and conclusions because of which Bofors haunts all of us. It is no longer a parochial problem. It does not delight us, becaus? if you ure diminished, the totality of Parliament is diminished—Then we too are diminished. If the moral authority of the entire system of governance is dimi-nished, .we are not going to get benefit out of it. What $ar_e$ the overriding impressions and conclusions? This is stated now through the land that this Government is not interested in establishing the truth in matters relating Bofors. Number 2: that this Government appears overanxious to protect Bofors S.A., M/s Win Chadha and the Hindujas. Number 3; that this Government drags its feet when presented with incontrovertible evidence as for example what ihe "Hindu' did and those documents. Number 4; that this Government conducts itself as if it were being held to ransom by an armament dealer, a petty arms pedlai, Bofors S.A. Number 5; I implore the Government to examine these documents. I do not want to take the time of the House by quoting from there. A number of other speakers from the Treasury Benches and from this side have already done so. Three things have to be stated. Three identities stand established. Svenska, A&E Services, Moi-neau, Moresco or Pitco. Three code names that stand established are Lotus, Tulip and Mont Blanc. I submit to you that in the case of Tulip, there is indeed a note here which disturbs me and which makes me implore the Government to examine them and the note says, on the invoice of bank payment, "if it is possible, don't write who the payer is." This is a noting made on the invoice itself. In the light of all this, how could Mr. N. K. P. Salve have said that this is a $baza_r$ gossip, that this is not worth the paper on which it is published. That is what compelled me to authenticate it and lay it on the Table of the House.

Now I will conclude by asking five <*y* six direct questions and then just one piece of advice to the Government. (/»-*terniptioii).* The Prime Minister. Sir, in the interview reported in this paper has said and hon. the leader of the House on an earlier ocacsion also referred to it and I am repeating what my leader in the House has also stated. The Prime Minister has said that "had we cancelled this. it would $hav_e$ resulted in a delay of one year and possibly, an additional cost of Rs. 1,000 crores." Sir, the question of cancellation of the contract with Bofors had a relevance and va'ue at a certain point of time We cannot discuss this cancellation in abstract. When at this point of time, of the possibility of contract cancellation came up, it is my belief and I put it to you again with all sense of *i* responsibility that the Army Headquarters.

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

in writing, communicated to the Prime Minister's Office that the consequences of the cancellation of Bofors contract would, at the ni ost, result in a delay of six months and that we would not have to pay much extra money, leave alone one year and Rs. 1,000 crores that the Prime Minister is talking of. Therefore, I submit that if the Government really wants to establish its bona fides, let copies of that correspondence or advice given by the Army Headquarters to the Prime Minister's office be presented to Parliament. Let the Members have a chance to examine that for themselves. My second question is did the Government, at any stage, question either M/*, Win Chadha or Hindujas, after the revelation of the 'Hindu' documents, about aspects like Svenska? "Mr. Win Chadha, your name is being linked with Svenska, what do you have to say?" Was he charged with it? Was Hinduja asked, "Yuur name has been linked with Moresco, Moineau and Pitco. What do you have *© say?" If they were not aksed, why were tnev not asked? And if they were asked, what has the Government found? I do not know whether Mr. Win Chadha fs now in Tndia. He has been permitted [o leave the country. Is he in the countiy? In the duration for. which he was in the country, he was charged with offences which had nothing to do with Bofors. And he has been permitted to leave the country without yet having been examined once by this Government on the question of Bofors. Unless you clarify these aspects, this debate will remain in and these points will keep on coming up. Fourthly, prior to the CBI team's visit to Sweden, was any formal request for co--operation from the investigative agencies of Sweden or from the Government of Sweden made by the Government of India? The next question is: Have you,

till now, even till today, asked Bofors about thes.; documents, which "The Hindu' published and to which we are referring and which I have aheady submitted to the Chair? The next question is: Have you asked the Government of Sweden, even till today, for any kind of assistance...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA); Please, conclude now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: . .in the investigation of Bofors? And Sir, my final question is: Why are you dragging your feet on the question of cooperation with the Government of Switzerland, the Federal Government of Switzerland?

SHRI TIRATH RAM AMLA (Jammu and Kashmir): He has repeatedly said that he had laid on the Table those verified documents. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *atias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Already the Government has agreed to examine these documents. *It* is under investigation. What is wrong in submitting these documents? *(Interruptions)* The Member has a right to place it on the Table for additional information. *(Interruptions)* There may be some other document which you have not seen.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Aladi Aruna, you ar; going to speak. Why do you encroach upon others' time?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Now, I will conclude by asking the Prime Minister to do only that which he himself has publicly committed to do, about finding out the guilty and bringing them to book. I conclude. Sir, by appealing to the Prime Minister to do only that, to do it with recognisable despatch, to consult with us, to inform the Parliament about what is being done, to share with us, the Parliament, the difficulties that the Government is facing in going through this investigation, to convince us. Parliament, and the nation about its intents. Only that will clear the air, settle this debate and settle the issues. Sir, at the height of the Second World War, when Great Britain as a nation was under threat, Winston Churchill said of himself, and of the institution of Prime Minister, this and I repeat what he said because it has a relevance to our context and because T agree with that. He said, of himself and of the institution of Prime Minister, that *i^e* the

Prime Minister falters he must be supported. I agree. If he is mistaken he must be guided. I agree. When he sleeps his rest must not be unwisely disturbed. I agree. But if he fails to deliver the goods, •he must be poleaxed. With that also I agree because if you do not deliver the goods, in this particular matter, not only will these issues keep on coming up but, certainly, in time, the people of India will poleaxe him. Thank you.

SHRl P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. 1 rise to briefly intervene in this debate on the core issues that have been confronting this issue right from the beginning and the manner in which *(Interruptions)* . these issues are sought to be handled by my friend$_s$ on the other side. What is this debate for in the ultimate analysis ? We have debated this issue for quite a number of times in both the Houses. And I wish researches could go into how much *tpt»'.* has been consumed and how much expenditure has been involved in the process and I am sure ii is bound to be a larger amount than what my friendg on the other side allege has passed in this deal. The session started on the 2nd. The newly formed party perhaps found that they did not have any issues. So it was thought that something should be spun. And what is it that has been spun? It is the statement which his made by the lead erof that party referring to the account number, the name of the account and saying that it pertains to the Prime Minister and that the amouul has gone there. This, in my submission is the height of irresponsibility. I say irresponsibility because after two days the very stand was changed and it was said that what he had mentioned, the account, belongs to Svenska and that what has already appeared in *The Hindu* has been highlighted. This appeared long back, in April, and Government immediately took actioa to refer the matter to CBI about the authenticity of the documents and to pursue the same. Why this was done was to set the ball rolling- They thought since no issues were available and once Parliament assembled again afer the holidays there must be some fireworks, it is precisel/ with this in the background that this issue has been raised It should not be forgot— ten and before 1 go further I would like £» remind the nation that this gentleman :s the same gentleman who had approved this deal as a Finance Minister; it is on record. And please do not forget that a man who can ascend through the ladder of this nation and kick off the ladder, will equally kick you all. Please beware! *lt* this is the political morality for which you are pleading, by all means do so: but this type of poli ical morality will cost the nation heavily. I would like to ask whether this type of debate which seeks really to discredit the democratic institution* of this country is worth pursuing, be it the Treasury Benches, be it the Opposi tion. I am grateful to Mr. Gurupadaswamy who raised an identical question. But he himself drifted. I would start by saying that the charge he made and equally made by one of my friends, Shri Dipen Ghosh, was that we are prevaricating and that there are inconsistent stands. I would like to submit that there are two parts of this issue. One part of the issue is whether the Governmsnt directly comes into the picture, the statement made by those concerned in the Government and the direct responsibilty that they have to assu'ne for what they have said. The other aspect is the inforamtion or the stand based on that information which is not in your uos-session, but on which you have got to be guided by somebody cise. So far as the first part is concerned, the Government's stand was very clear. We said that there should be no middle men and no amount should be paid to them, meaning thereby that the money should not influence the contract part of it. Now, on this part of it, the Government is wholly barred. Ther* used to be middle men. It is a matter which is known not only in our country, but also internationally, that in the defence deals middle men are there and it *it* a matter of fact. The law^ the Contract Law> validates it, it permits it. and legality is attached to the concept of commission and commission agents. It is not illegal. Now. what is it that this Government has done? This Government has said that there

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

should be no middle men and that they shouid not be paid and the contract should not be influenced in any form. Have we prevancated from this stand? Ha^ there been any evidence to show that the Governmsnt directly or indirectly had been a privy for purposes of having the middle men or to the money having been passed on to influence the contract? in fact, the story is otherwise. When I say that the Story is otherwise, you can kindly look up and see that when the offer, the actual offer, was made by the company, the offer was made for Rs. 1,700 crores. I am not going into the nitty-gritty of the problemi because I would only like to deal broadly with this issue. Now, what has happened? The Prime Minister of Sweden was categorically informed that there should b» no middle men, that there shall be a direct negotiation with th'j governmental authorities for the purpose of sorting out this issue There was a Technical Committee for the purpose of going into the fact whether the gun is of the capability that we want, And, Sir, T must say that today there are two honourable Members on the Opposition side, who are sMng here now, who have paid compliments to the gun, and they have said that ths is the best gun. I do not know whether It lies in thi; mouths of them to prevaricate at this stage and be inconsistent and just to denounce what they themselves have said puWicly. That $i_s$ a different issue altoeeth£L. But, on the auestion cf the **gun, •■**

SHRI JASWANT STNGH : Sir will the honourable Minister yield fc* a minute" Sir. will $th_e$ honourable Leade: of the House yield for a minute?

I did certainly $_s$ay and I continue to say that. But I think the !wo are totally unrelated asoects. One is about the qualifv of the nun and it $i_s$ a high-quality i>uu and I continue to sav that. Am I prevaricating on it? I am not prevaricating on it-But the aspect of commission paid on ;' and ronufition attendant upon the deal remains.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have not come to that: I hav^ not come to *thai* as yet.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab). That is what I have also said. Probably you are now doubting that I am going *to* say something against the gun itself? That $surprise_s$ me, I have said that $thes_e$ kickbacks aie worse than the back, blast. *(Interruptions)*

SHRl P. SHIV SHANKER: I thought that they were going to join issue on the statement that I made. I am grateful to them they have supported my statement. *(Interruption)* I only said, Mr. Jaswant Singh, whether they would like to prevaricate. I $neve_r$ said that you $hav_e$ prevaricated. Please follow m^ language. You know better English than me. I thought I was trying to tell him $i_n$ a very simple language.

/

Now, Sir, the point that I was trying to make, I was trying to deal with, was the question of stand that was taken by the Government. And the submission that I Was making was that we wanted to eschew the middlemen. We wanted that money should not be paid to influence the contract in any form.

How do you judge this? How do you judge our oenduct? Now, on the question that money should not $b_e$ paid for the purpose of influencing the contract, in the facts and circumstances, how do you judge our conduct? Our conduct can only I.e judged on two accounts. One. whether th; gun is of an inferior quality in any form. It is for that purpose I was trying to make the submission, that the two hon. Members sitting on the other side are on record that the gun is of the best quality. Apart from the fact that a committee of technicians have gone into it, which detai's have already been given by the **JPC,** I would not like to go into it, he detailed names have come Officers have come in. Unless one wou'd like to say that all these officers are dishonest—that $i_s$ a matter which I leave to $th_e$ judgement and wisdom of my friends sitting on the ofier side. . . *(Interruptions)*

Now, one side dealt with the aspect of quality. T3» other aspsjt is whether money has bean passed for the purpose of frfluentiqjj ti« contract in any way. It is there where I was trying to say that the Prime Minister of Sweden was categorically informed that there should not be an^ middlemen taking money to influence the contract itself. We took all steps that were possible. And then there was the pricing committee, consisting of a bunch of officials, very highly placed, who have gone into the issue who bargained with the company, and have tried to see that the price is beaten down. In the ultimate analysis, *thi* offer of R=,. 1700-crores has been brough- down to R-*. 1400 crores or something, with the resultant effect of Rs, 300 erores advantage- unless you would like to go to the extent of saying that all these officers who were appointed on the pricing committee are ihe persons who should not be believed or if you would like to impute motives to them, which luckily so far nobody has alleged. If this be the position, I would like to ask you a question, where does the Government come into the picture on its own stand with reference to middlemen not being there, with reference to payments being made to them for the purpose of influencing the contract in any form? Where is the prevarication?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): This is a new thing you are say-_ing. You are saying that there should not be any middlemen. *(Intemiptions)* Now, you arei again shifting. ]

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I started by saying, menning thereby. . . *(Intemiptions)*

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: You are again shifting.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal); The argument of middlemen influencing the contract was r^t there earlier. Now the Leader of the House has brought in that notion of the middlemen influencing the contract.

SA1DAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I maw be :v'mitted to say something on i'. J maintain that it is a very good gun. He said that he wanted to ask a question. I have stood up because the Leader of the House saij that he wanted to ask a question to which 1 would like to respond. That is all. Eventually, we had two guns.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have never put a question to you.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: If you permit. I will speak. Otherwise, 1 will sit down.

SHRl P. SHIV SHANKER: If you like to say something, I will yield. But I have never put any question to you. That is my submission. If you like to say something, I will yield.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Thank you, very much. The point is whether the decision could be influenced. There were two guns which were equally good. One was the French and the other one was the Bofor's. I am repeating the statement mad.; by the Chief of Army Staff who has now left. He said. .. *(In-terruptions)*. He said that in his briefing to $u_s$ when we went to Army Headquarter. I am only repeating that. In his briefing to the parliamentary party who went there, *hi* said that. Therefore, to decide who is going to get the contract, influence could still be used. I am only answering the point whether influence could be used or not.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have not been able to make head or tail of what he has said. I have made a reference to the hon. Member only on the question of quality. I would like to proceed ahead. The submission that I was making was that we, on our part, were categorical that there should be no middlemen. There is not an iota of evidence to suggest that the Government $i_n$ any form, directly or indirectly, has engaged middlemen. As I submitted at the very outset. I have added that aspect of influencing the contract because the middlemen normally are meant for the puiposes of directly or indirectly influencing the contract. That is one aspect of it. The other aspect of it is the middlemen getting money after the supplies under the contract have been effected. That is wholly a different issue altogether.

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

Therefore, when we ^re trying *U>* say- that there should be no middlemen, our approach was that the Government should get this gun at the cheapest rate possible and this is precisely the objective that we have achieved. *(Interruptions)* ^ -]

राम अवधेश सिंह जी आपकी इंटेलीजेंसी बड़ी पक्की है। आप अगर इंटेलीजेंस में घुस जाय तो आप वहां बड़ा अच्छा काम करेंगे ।

Therefore, the point that 1 was trying to make was that the aspect where the Government comes into the picture and where the Government could be squarely accused, were these two issues about which the position stands absolutely clear. There is no prevarication whatsoever so far as the Government is concerned. Our stand remains. Throughout we have taken this stand and \\t adhere to it.

The friends have gone to the extent of saying that look in April 1987 you have said that nobody is involved. Then you have talked about winding-up charges. Then, of course, now the allegation is made about commission. I would like to make a clear statement on this aspect as well. What is it that you are charging the Government with today? You are charging the Government today of inconsistencies.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Sup pressing the truth.

SHRI P SHIV SHANKER: Well, is there any basis for suppression ? I would very much appreciate if you bring any evidence to show that there is a suppression. By these facts, if you want to come to the conclusion that there is suppression, then I am sorry, you are too poor a rationalist to come to that conclusion.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: There is your own statement.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: What I am trying to say is this that the Government has not hidden anything in this case. You kindly see the debates. Documents have been filed which have come from the Bofors, and the reports that were furnished based on what ^rr. Ringberg, had gore into. In fact if you kindly recall, immediately in June, 1987, when we had received the report, the Prime Minister called the Leaders of the Opposition, and the copies of the report were made available to all of you on that occasion. I was there im the CCPA at that time when these copies were supplied. Copies of the documents from time to time which have come to our notice have been placed on the Tables of both the Houses. Now you please tell me. I ask you a question. In a matter which is no; within my knowledge, suppose you accuse me that I am a thief, and suppose you say that I have committed theft i«t such and such house, now somebody has got to get this infoimation. Government has to necessarily ask the Bofors. Immediately after there was a flash in the radio about this news, the Government contacted the Bofors, lt was not the fabrication or the creation of the news by the Government when the Government said that no Indian is involved, no commission has been paid. It is because the Bofors Company said, this, which are the parts of the record in the House and in the other! House, /and in the] documents.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: They said at your instance,

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER; I would very much love if that is the perversity to which you would like to go, if you can prove that it is at our instance. .. *(Interruption)* I accuse you of the perversity of expression, nothing else. No realistic person can come to this conclusion at all.

SHRI PARVATHANENl UPENDRA: You briefed them for three days.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER; *If* the conclusions have to be drawn on perversities, this is precisely the question that 1 have raised: Are we doing service to the democratic institutions in this country ? If we have to demolish them, fair enough. That is totally a different issue altogether. But what I am trying to say is this that ,it is the Bofors which supplied the information. When the Bofors have supplied the details that these are the winding' op charges, we have not withheld, *wc* hare placed

*h* on the Table of the House. You are attributing that these are the stands of ours. It caiinot be. This information is not within our knowledge. Our stand was absolutely clear. We said that there should be no middlemen, that no amount should be stand. Now it transpires that the party, the party from whom one has to get the information, we got the information, we passed it on We were honest enough, we were honest enough to supply to the nation and the House the information that came to us. We did not spin it in any other form. We thought it is better that information must be shared with the nation. Now, your accusation that this is a prevarication does not fit into the texture at all. It is not onr prevarication. It is a different thing as to what you are say-in® today or what you had been asking. You are saying that you blacklist, you call for the money or take action against this Company. It is a wholly different aspect altogether. I am not going into it. I am on a simple point. I am not standing here for the purpose of scoring a debating point. I would like that we should at least have some respect for the grain of truth. Now we have placed all the documents before the House and we have been trying to explain and 1 would like to tell you that according to me, I have said even earlier, that if we assume that what has appeared in the Hindu, the documents that have come, if they are assumed to be true and authentic, then they indicate that the commission has been paid and you would say again, look, this is again anothe,- prevarication. The prevarication $i_s$ where I have to take a stand on the basis of facts that $_are$ in my possession, and if I am changing my stand that is understandable. But where one has to rely wholly on somebody else and has got ID get the information and on the basis of that information you act. *(Interruptions)* .

I would like to tell you one thing. You kindly go into the cases.

जांच की बात जो आप कह रहे हैं, इस देश में सुबह से शाम तक गरीब तक गरीब लोगों की मौत होती है मार दिये जाते हैं उनके कितने केसेज कोर्ट में सक्सेसफुल होते हैं। आप जांच की बात करते हैं... (व्यवधान) आप जांच की बात कर रहे हैं इस वास्ते ही मैं आपसे कह रहा हूं कि लोग जानते हैं कि मर्डर हुआ और आप जैसे हम जैसे ही ये लोग हैं जो देखने के बावजूद भी मुंह मोड़ लेते हैं। हम बोलते हैं कि भाई अदालत के चक्कर कहां से लगाएंगे और पुलिस वाला 25 मरतबे फिर आयेगा। यह हमारी रिस्पांसिबिलिटी है।... (व्यवधान) मैंने तो एक छोटी सी मिसाल आपको दी है... (व्यवधान) मैं आ रहा हूं... (व्यवधान) इन्होंने जो बात की है मैं उसका जवाब दे रहा हूं। मैं आपकी बात पर नहीं आया हूं।... (व्यवधान)

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह** : जांच की जवाब देही तो आप पर की है।

**श्री पी० शिव शंकर** : जब यह मालूम हुआ कि "हिन्दु" अखबार से कुछ कागजात की छपाई हुई है...

In fact I would like to go to the extent of congratulating that lady, Chitra Subramaniam, who has really brought out some thing. 4|

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह** : "हिन्दु" पर केस कर दीजिए कि झूठा छापा है।

**श्री पी. शिवशंकर** : मैं एक तरफ उसकी तारीफ कर रहा हूं और आप कहते हैं दावा करो। आपका दिमाग भी अजीब है... (व्यवधान) अगर ये डाक्यूमेंट सच हैं तो उनकी बधाई देनी चाहिए।

Therefore that matter is under investigation.

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह** : आप सच तो नहीं मानते हैं।

**श्री पी. शिवशंकर** : अगर आप मुझे नहीं बोलने देना चाहते हैं तो और बात है। आप अपनी आदत से मजबूर हैं मैं क्या करूं। आप अपनी आंखों पर पट्टी बांधकर रखे हुए है। आप देखना ही नहीं चाहते हैं तो अब हम क्या दिखाएंगे आपको कोई भी नहीं दिखा सकता है भगवान भी नहीं दिखा सकता है आपको।

Now$_i$ the submissions that I was making was that these documents have been fabricated. Therefore the submission that I would lite $t_0$ make is that it is not a case

[Shri P. 3hi\t Shankar]

of inconsistency which is being charged by the other side. It is a matter which is not in our possession and you have to receive it fro© somebody else and every time, a debate goes on and naturally whatever is available by then ha$_s$ got to be placed before the House. You have got to take your stand based on the information that has com© to you and if you say that this is prevarication, I am sorry for the poor legal acumen. o$_r$ Ihe poor rational approach that you have in the matter. Therefore in my submissions such a question does not arise in any form. I have already said, even previously I said that it appears to be very difficult to cancel the contract at this stage. I have said it or. more than one occasion. Of course for the question that has been raised by the hon. Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, about the writing of the Army Headquarters to the Ministry, I must say that I congratulate him for his resourcefulness of the information, because these people have more intelligence than us, because being a Minister of the Cabinet I am absolutely not aware, but he seems to be aware more than me, I congratulate Mm for the efforts that he has put in, but this is a matter which the Defence Minister will reply. But I have been saying time and again and I have given the details in every deba'e and I would not like to go into it again as to the immense harm that would be caused if you annul the contract. The amounts I have given about Rs. 800 to 900 crores, and the damage that you will suffer will be the setback to the defence preparedness which will be relegated to the background fo$_r$ quite some time. And meanwhile, supposing something unfortunate happens, we will have to suffer the consequences. Apart from this, as I said, if you would like to go into other causes of it. I do not know whether in our place you would have taken a decision to blacklist them. Once it is proved that thi$_s$ is the best gun from the quality point of view, and theie is a clause for the purpose of manufacturing that gun here, and there is also a clause for the purpose of transfer of technology for the purpose of manufacture of diat gun, keeping that in view, whlthe$_r$ you would like to blacklist them is a question on facts which you have to weigh and decide. If you have to tak© the decision to blacklist them, you must forgo this advantage. Now, whether the nation should forgo this advantage, is a matter which we have to decide based' on facts. Prime Minister has said that the option of recalling money is still open. But that is a different matter which is still open, and I do not go into that. The point is, we seem to be groping in the dark. We seem to be only guided by a certain app-roach. Political approach for the purpose of creating a psychology i$_s$ perfectly all right; but there should be $_a$ limit to it If you would like to transgress the limit and would like to destroy the institutions which have been so assiduously built up at great cost, by a tremendous secrihee by the nation, that is entirely a different approach altogehej- and I leave it to you.

1 thought, Mr Vive-Chairman, I should just intervene for the purpose of making the position clear and I thank the hon. Members for having given me this opportunity and listening to me at least with silence. Thank you.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY: But truth has been silenced by you.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARU-NACHALAM: Muzzled.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अभी जब माननीय सदन के नेता श्री पी० शिवशंकर जी बोल रहे थे तो मुझ लग रहा था शुरू में कि इनके अंदर का जज बोलेगा क्योंकि यह जज और वकील दोनों रह चुके हैं पहले वकील इसके बाद जज। शुरू में लगा था कि शायद इनके अंदर का जज बोलेगा लेकिन जज दब गया और वकील बोलने लगा क्योंकि जिस तरह से अपनी बहस बीच में इंटरवीन करके इन्होंने शुरू की और जो बात गलत साबित हो चुकी है उसकी भी वकील की तरह से, वकील की भाषा में सही साबित करने की बहुत असफल चेष्टा की है।

माननीय इसमें कोई शक नहीं है। कि जब से स्वीडिश रेडियो ने बोफोर्स

कांड के बारे में दुनिया को बताया, उसके बाद से लगातार सरकार के स्टैंड में परिवर्तन और इसके सबूत सारे रेकर्ड्स पर हैं। मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं। लेकिन रेफरेंस के लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि शुरू से लेकर अभी तक कई बातें कही गई। स्वीडिश रेडियो के बाद कहा गया कि बिलकुल गलतबयानी है, सरकार को डिस्टैबिलाईज करने के लिए यह सारी बातें कही गई हैं। फिर कहा गया कि मिडलमैन नहीं था, फिर कहा गया कि ब्लाइंडिंग-अप चार्जेज हैं, फिर कहा गया कि कोई राजनीतिक आदमी उसमें नहीं था, फिर यहां तक कि आकर प्रधान मंत्री को कहना पड़ा कि उसमें मेरा कोई हिस्सा नहीं है और मेरे परिवार के किसी आदमी का हाथ नहीं है।

यह तो किसी राष्ट्र के प्रधान मंत्री के लिए सब से छोटी बात हो सकती है और शर्म की बात हो सकती है कि प्रधान मंत्री को सदन में सफाई देनी पड़े कि मेरा और मेरे परिवार का इसमें कोई हाथ नहीं है। इसका मतलब कि सरकार की सारी जवाबदेही से बच कर केवल अपने परिवार को अपने कांडों से बचाना चाहते हैं, जबकि सरकार का दायित्व ऐसा जम्हूरियत में खास कर संसदीय प्रणाली में होता है, खास कर प्रधान मंत्री का कि उसकी कैबिनेट की उसकी मंत्रिपरिषद की या उस की सरकार के किसी अंग की कोई गलती हो तो उसकी जिम्मेदारी प्रधान मंत्री की मानी जाती है। वह प्रधान मंत्री सिमटते-सिमटते आकर अपने परिवार तक सिमट जाए, अपने तक सिमट जाए तो यह एक बहुत ओछी बात है और यह कोई बड़ी बात नहीं हो सकती। मान्यवर मैं इस पर ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता हूं केवल इस बहस को सीमित रखते हुए, क्योंकि सारी बातें कही जा चुकी हैं अब उनको दोहराने से कोई लाभ नहीं है, इसलिए मैं केवल इतनी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने जो डाकूमेंट जारी किया और उन्होंने फिर यह भी कहा कि "हिन्दू" में जो छपा है उसी को हमने कहा है इसको भी मान लीजिए तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि संयुक्त संसदीय समिति की जांच के बाद यह जो डाकूमेंट "हिन्दू" में प्रकाशित हुए और यह मांग की गई कि इस की जांच कर ली जाए फिर संयुक्त संसदीय समिति से अगर सरकार का हाथ साफ होता, सरकार का चेहरा साफ होता तो जैसे एक संसदीय समिति से जांच करा ली और अब नया डाकूमेंट आ गया और जिससे आपकी ईमानदारी पर प्रश्नवाचक चिन्ह लग गया तो उस प्रश्नवाचक चिन्ह को हटाने के लिए आपकी जिम्मेदारी थी कि उसकी भी आप जांच करा लेते। परन्तु आज भी कुछ बिगड़ा नहीं है, इतना ही वी०पी०सिंह का कहना है कि हमने जो दस्तावेज जारी किया है एक संयुक्त संसदीय समिति से क्या आप उसकी जांच कराने को तैयार है, इस पर सरकार क्यों भागती है? अगर सरकार सही है और अपने बचाव के सारे तर्क देती है, हम उस तर्क को थोड़े समय के लिए, बहस के लिए मान लेते हैं, लेकिन मैं थोड़ा सा, एक वाक्य का तर्क यह रखना चाहता हूं कि जब इस डाकूमेंट को आप गलत मानते हैं, इसको आप समझते है कि यह डाकूमेंट विश्वसनीय नहीं है, लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि इसी डाकूमेंट के आधार पर आप हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की अदालत में अविश्वसनीय हो गए हैं तो इस अविश्वसनीय डाकूमेंट की जांच के जरिए आप इस डाकूमेंट को अविश्वसनीय क्यों नहीं साबित कर देते? अगर आप का दामन साफ और पाक है तो इन दस्तावेजों की आप जांच करा लीजिए, इतनी ही तो मांग है, इस से अधिक तो मांग नहीं है।

मान्यवर, मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूं यह "सेंडे" की रिपोर्ट के बारे में और इधर से जो बात कही गई है अधूरी कही गई है, इसलिए इस में दो-तीन वाक्य मैं पढ़ूंगा और क्वशचन समेत पढ़ूंगा। इधर से जो साथियों ने पढ़ा है, उन्होंने केवल उत्तर पढ़ा है। क्वशचन का क्या रेलेवेंस है उस को मैं पढ़ना चाहता हूं।

क्वेश्चन था :

"We are not questioning the selection of the equipment."

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

इन्होंने कहा कि; प्रधान मंत्री ने कि हमारी सैक्योरिटी के ख्याल से अच्छा वैपनज है, बढ़िया है, इसलिए हमने खरीदा, तो उसके जवाब में क्वश्चन किया :

"The question is whether or not money ' was taken."

i The question is whether or not money was taken. Even for an ideal choice, say, a mercedes benz car, there could be considerations. The* question is whether a commission was takeo....

'The Prime Minister's reply was: ," "we paid..;' \

' That means, commission was paid. He says: " •" &"

"Obviously, how many million Kro-. ner-319 was the original number I think it ended up in 60 someting crores, 66 crores."

This was the reply of the Prime Minister. The interviewer pointed out that it was Rs. 64 crores. The Prime Minister said:

"Whatever it was. Anyway, that much monev was pay to somebody. That » clear. Nobody doubts that. Nobody argues about that. We do not question that."

"यह प्रधानमंत्री का जवाब है। आगे फिर क्वेश्चन है --

"But to whom. Who got the money"

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हैच० हनुमनतप्पा) : सारा का सारा पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है। आपका टाइम चला जाएगा।

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH: The question is to whom and for what.

एक और पढ़ देता हूं। इसी में सारी बात आ जाती है।

"If it was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors, then We cannot question it. " Then, "No, not gen-uine. Your deal with Bofors made it quite clear that there would be no mid-dlernent. So, there could be no genuine work, they were paid for.

यह क्वेश्चन का जवाब है --

"No, not genuine work in terms of middlemen Genuine work gathering information against the French weapon, for example. That is industrial espionage. You cannot grudge them, that you cannot."

मान्यवर, इन बातों से यह बात स्पष्ट है कि प्रधानमंत्री ने स्वीकार कर लिया कि यह कमीशन दिया गया और कमीशन देने के लिए वे यह कहते है कि जेनुइन काम के लिए, सही काम के लिए दिया गया। "सही काम" की परिभाषा क्या देते हैं कि इंफोरमेशन गेदर करने के लिए। इंफोरमेशन कैसे गेदर होती है? डील जब करते हैं आप दूसरी कंपनी से, दूसरे देश से तो उसमे क्या इंफोरमेशन गेदर करेंगे ...(समय की घंटी) .....इंफोरमेशन गेदर करना कि कंपरेटिव स्टडी दे सकते हैं, जैसे फ्रैंच से भी हमारी गन खरीदी जाने वाली थीं, उनमें कौन अच्छी है। तो इस बात के लिए कमीशन क्यों देगा? बोफोर्स कमीशन क्यों देगा यह बात साधारण समझ की बात है, जो प्रधानमंत्री ने कहा कि कंपरेटिव इंफोरमेशन देने के लिए, एज फोर एग्जाम्पल फ्रेंच गन, तो फ्रेंच गन और स्वीडिश गन में कौन बेटर है, क्या टेक्नीकल्टी है? इसकी इंफोरमेशन देने के लिए कौन कंपनी किसी को 64 करोड़ का कमीशन देगी, दलाली देगी? यह बात साधारण समझ की बात है।

मान्यवर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं ...(समय की घंटी)... अंत में ही थोड़ी और बात है। मान्यवर, मैं यह कह रहा था कि जब प्रधानमंत्री ने यह स्वीकार कर लिया और जब मैंने यह अखबार में पढ़ा तो मुझे एक कहावत याद आ गई—सैंध पर विरह का गाना गाना। इसी प्रकार प्रधानमंत्री का यह बयान है।

सेंध पर विरह का गाना गाना, शायद आप लोग जानते होंगे, यानी चोरी और सीना जोरी, दोनों एक साथ। जब कोई चोरी करने गया, सेंध पर ही वह विरह का गाना गाने लगा कि हम चोरी कर रहे हैं। इसी प्रकार का यह बयान है, पहले तो कहा हमारा कोई रिश्ता नहीं है, कोई मिडिल मैन नहीं है और अगर होगा तो उसे दंड दिया जायगा। अब यह स्वीकार किया है कि जेनुइन वर्क के लिए तो हमने दिया है, यह कोई बुरी बात नहीं है। अभी यहां फ्लोर पर भी लीडर आफ दी हाउस माननीय शिवशंकर जी ने कहा कि यह लीगल है कमीशन देना, कोई गलत काम नहीं है। यह बात इन्होंने यहां स्वीकार की। आपने यह पहले क्यों नहीं कहा ? आप पहले कह देते तो बात खतम हो जाती, इतना झमेला क्यों होता। आज जो आप कह रहे हैं—कमीशन दिए है और इंफोरमेशन गेदर करने के लिए दिए हैं। यही बात आप शुरू में कह देते कि दिया है कमीशन, हमारे परिवार के लोगों ने नहीं लिया है, यह लीगल है, उचित है, इटरनेशनल कांटेक्ट में होता है। उस दिन तो आप साधु बनने लगे कि हम कुछ नहीं लेते, कुछ नहीं जानते। लेकिन अब आप घिर चके है, सारे दस्तावेज आ गए है, प्रधानमंत्री घिर गए हैं, इनका दामन पाक-साफ नहीं है। दामन पर कालिख लग चुकी है और मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप चाहे जितनी सफाई देते रहे और बहुमत के बल पर हमारी कमजोर आवाज को दबा लें, लेकिन सड़क पर, खेत-खलिहान में—चारों तरफ लोग कहते हैं कि बोफोर्स में बहुत दलाली ली गयी है और कोई थोड़ा भी गड़बड़ आदमी दिखता है जोकि गड़बड़ी करता है तो रिक्शे वाला भी कहता है कि इसमें कुछ बोफोर्स मालूम होता है। मतलब इसमें कुछ गड़बड़ है, दलाली है। यह बोफोर्स तो आज एक तरह से विश्लेषण के रूप में जनता यूज करती है। आप जनता के कठघरे में हैं, इसलिए आप एक काम कीजिए कि जो डाकूमेंट रिलीज किया गया है उसके लिए एक संयुक्त संसदीय समिति की जांच बिठाइए, नयी कमेटी गठित कीजिए और पंद्रह दिन या एक महीने के अंदर केवल इस डाकूमेंट्स को आप जांच करके साफ कर दीजिए तो आपके चेहरे पर जो दाग है वह साफ हो जाएगा। आप अगर नयी कमेटी नहीं बिठाओगे तो दाग साफ नहीं होगा। आप जनता की नजर में कसूरवार हैं और कुसूरवार रहेंगे। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं।

**श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल** (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं 12 बजे से ही सभी लोगों के और विशेषरूप से अपने विरोधी साथियों के भाषण सुन रहा हूं। अभी मैंने श्री राम अवधेश जी का भाषण सुना। यह बड़ी विचित्र और बड़ी दुखद स्थिति है जिसमें यह बहस हो रही है। हमारे भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो डाकुमेंट्स या जो पत्र जारी किए हैं, जैसाकि आपने कहा, वह वही है जो हिन्दू में छपे है कोई नया पत्र नहीं है और जो हिंदू में छपा था उस पर तो पावस सत्र में बहस हो चकी थी। उसके बाद कोई नयी चीज नही कही गयी है। सिर्फ एक पुरानी बात को बार-बार दोहराया जा रहा है जैसा कि हिटलर का गोबल्स था। बार-बार झूठ बोलकर उसको सत्य साबित करना चाहता था उसी तरह से राम अवधेश जी और उनके साथी उसको सत्य साबित करना चाहते है। हमारे विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी ने जो तीन डाकुमेंट्स जारी किए हैं और हिंदू में जो जारी किया गया है—उन दोनों के विवरणों को अगर आप मिलाइए तो आप देखेंगे कि वे बिल्कुल भिन्न हैं। कागजात वही हैं, दलील भिन्न है। क्या कहा है उन्होंने। उन्होंने पहली बात कही कि लोट्स के नाम स्विस बैंक कार्पोरेशन जेनेवा के खाता नंबर 99921 पीयू में कमीशन जमा किया और यह खाता राजीव का है और बाद में मुकर गए। हिंदू में भी यही नम्बर था लेकिन वहां पीयू की जगह टीयू था और उसमें था कि यह लोटस का नहीं स्वेंस्का का खाता है। लोटस नाम के खाते में भी कुछ जमा किए जाने की बात थी, लेकिन उसका कोई नम्बर

[श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल]

नहीं दिया गया था । परन्तु जल्दी में उसको पढ़कर हमारे विश्वनाथ बाबू जी ने पहले उस को लोटस का खाता बनाया, राजीव का खाता बनाया और उसमें जमा कराया । दूसरी बात उन्होंने कही, जैसाकि 5 नवम्बर के 'इंडियन एक्सप्रेस' में छपा था कि 19 दिसम्बर, 86 को बैंक से कहा गया कि जमा करने वाले का नाम न बताया जाए । हिन्दू में इस बात की भी चर्चा थी लेकिन वहां जो एकाऊंट था वह न लोटस का था, न स्वेत्का का था, वह एकाउंट था ट्यैलिप । यह हिंदू में था । अब हिंदू सही कह रहा है या विश्वनाथ जी सही कह रहे हैं, इसे कौन तय करेगा ? हो सकता है विश्वनाथ जी ने कोई ऐसे कागजात देखे हों जो हिंदू के पास हों और हिंदू ने उनको नहीं छापा हो, उनको संसार नहीं जानता लेकिन वह जानते होंगे । तीसरी बात जो उन्होंने 6.00 P.M. कही, उन्होंने तीन राशियां बताई, इनवाइसिज के नम्बर बताए, धनराशि बताई कि यह रुपया कमीशन के रूप में दिया गया और उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वह एवजर्ड है क्योंकि वह एक दूसरे कान्ट्रेक्ट के बारे में है । वह एक दूसरा कान्ट्रेक्ट भारत सरकार को सप्लाई करने के बारे में था । उस कान्ट्रेक्ट का नम्बर था 6(5)/84 डी/(जी०एस०)-4 । यह कान्ट्रेक्ट जो था यह एल-70 तोपों के साज समान को मुहैया कराने के बारे में था । तो जो टोटल अमाउंट सप्लाइज का था वह हमारे विश्वनाथ जी ने दे दिया है जब कि उस पर कमीशन पेयबल था वह उसके पहले की बात थी और वह जो कमीशन था, वह जो पहला उन्होंने अमाउंट बताया 47,29,190 स्विस फ्रांक का, उस पर 6 परसेंट का कमीशन था और बाकी के दो फिगर्स थे उस पर .96 परसेंट का कमीशन था । उन्होंने कमीशन का अमाउंट नहीं दिया है, उन्होंने टोटल कान्ट्रेक्ट का अमाउंट दे दिया है और कहा गया कि इतना कमीशन खाया, 32 मिलियन फ्रांक का कमीशन खाया गया है । तो जिस आदमी को यह ही नहीं पता कि डिटेल्ज क्या हैं, उस आदमी की बात के ऊपर क्या बहस की जाए उसका तो एक ही लक्ष्य है कि राजीव गांधी को हटाओ । उसने कभी राजीव गांधी के अलावा कोई और नाम लिया है ? राजीव गांधी को हटाया जाए, क्यों हटाया जाए, क्योंकि राजीव गांधी के हटने से कांग्रेस सरकार हटेगी । राजीव गांधी के मायने हैं कांग्रेस सरकार, और क्यों हटाया जाए क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री पद के लिए रास्ता साफ हो जाए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सन् 1980 में हमारे यू० पी० के कांग्रेस विधान मण्डल दल ने संजय गांधी को अपना नेता सर्वसम्मति से चुना था कि मुख्य मंत्री बनायेंगे । संजय गांधी ने राजा साहब को नामिनेट किया कि मुख्य मंत्री यह बनेंगे, उनके कहने पर यह मुख्य मंत्री बने और जब डकैतों का मामला चला और 10-12 सौ यादवों की हत्या की गई तो उसके बाद वह छोड़कर चले गए । फिर मिसेज गांधी ने उनको मंत्री बनाया और राजीव गांधी ने तो उनको नम्बर दो बना दिया । राजीव गांधी तो उनके मित्र की तरह थे, बड़े भाई की तरह थे । तो मित्र के साथ धोखा करना, मित्र के साथ द्रोह करना और जिस फैमिली ने उनको बनाया, बजाए इसके कि उसके वह कृतज्ञ हों, वह कृतघ्नी साबित हुए और पूरे कैबिनेट के साथ, जिसके साथ उन्होंने काम किया, जो आज वह कहते हैं कि हमने यह फाइल देखी थी, वह फाइल देखी थी, पूरे मंत्री मण्डल के साथ आज वह विश्वासघात कर रहे हैं और अभी मुझे याद आया कि हमारे जो आदिपुरुष थे, दार्शनिक मनु, उनका एक श्लोक है इसी के ऊपर

"मित्रद्रोही कृतघ्नश्च: तथा विश्वास-घातका: (ड वधान)

मैं मनु का श्लोक सुना रहा हूं जो शाश्वत सत्य है

"मित्रद्रोही कृतघ्नश्च: तथा विश्वासघातक: ।
सर्वस्ते नर्कयान्ति यावच्चन्द्र दिवाकरौ ।।"

जब तक आसमान में सूरज और चान्द हैं, मित्र का द्रोही, कृतघ्नी और विश्वासघाती नरक में रहेगा । आज आप उनको सर के ऊपर बिठाए बैठे हैं जिस पार्टी ने उनको इतना दिया, जिन लोगों ने दिया, आज वह उनकी पीठ में छुरा घोंपकर बैठे हैं । आपके पास तो नेताओं का अकाल है । आपका कोई नेता नहीं था, किसी की क्रेडिबिलिटी नहीं थी, एक नया नेता आपको चाहिए था अपनी क्रैडिबिलिटी जमाने के लिए और आपको विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह में वह नेता मिल गया । सारे विपक्ष ने उठाकर उसे अपने सर पर बैठा लिया है और उसके पीछे-पीछे आप लग गए हैं ।

SHRI MOTURU HAN MANTH A RAO: Just a flfuefition. Does he mean to say that all these dftcuments which have been *ti*-vealed to press now were kept as Cabinet secrets?

SHRI P. N SUKUL: No, DO. What 1 have said, you have not followed. I said that they were very old documents and that they were published in "THE HINDU". There is nothing new about them. *(Inter* ruptions)* TIBV?Jt- "'**-

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. MANUMANTHAPPA): Don't convert it into a dialogue.

■an

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: You reconcile, they are the same documents as published in 'THE HINDU" and as now released to the pres$_s$ by Mr. V P. Singh

; मैं विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी के चरित्र पर प्रकाश डाल रहा था क्योंकि वे राजीव गांधी को *कहते है, *कहते हैं, उनको निकालो कहते हैं जो कि वह साबित नहीं कर पाए हैं, विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जब तक कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर रहे 1980 के बाद, हर मंत्री जून के महीने में अपने ऐसेट्स की डिटेल देता है प्रधान मंत्री को, लेकिन उन्होंने एक भी नहीं दिया है ।

"Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

He did not give the annual details of his assets as necessary, as desired, to the Prime Minister.

बाकी सारे मंत्री देते हैं, लेकिन विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने सेंट्रल मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से नहीं दिया । मैं आग्रह करना चाहूंगा अपने गृह मंत्री जी से, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से कि वे इस बारे में पता लगाएं कि कितने ऐसे मंत्री हैं जिनको सालाना रिटर्न देनी चाहिए थी अपने ऐसेट्स के बारे में, उन्होंने नहीं दी, क्या विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह भी उनमें से एक है ?

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगश देसाई** पीठासीन हुये ।)

श्रीमन्, जैसा अभी हमारी बहन बोल रही थीं, जयन्ती जी कह रही थीं, उस पर आपने गौर नहीं किया । वह कह रही थीं कि सेंट्रल मिनिस्टर बनने से पहले दिल्ली में उनके पास क्या प्रापर्टी थी और मिनिस्टर बनने के दौरान कितने कामर्शियल कांप्लेक्स, कितने अपार्टमेंट्स दिल्ली में उन्होंने ऐक्वायर किए । आप जानते हैं कि इनमें कितने ट्रांजेक्शंस होते हैं वे आधी कीमत के होते हैं और आधा पैसा ब्लैक में दिया जाता है इनकम टैक्स बचाने के लिए । दिल्ली में बाराखंभा रोड पर, कैलाश अपार्टमेंट में, नेहरू प्लेस में, महरौली में कितने ऐक्वायर किए ? कहां से आया वह पैसा ? इसीलिए उन्होंने अपने ऐसेट्स नहीं दिए, अगर ऐसेट्स दिए होते तो पता लग जाता कि कितने बड़े हैं ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र** : क्या लिए है ? ... (व्यवधान)

**श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल** : अब तो वे आपके नेता हैं आप जानते हैं, मिश्र जी आपको मालूम नहीं है कि एक जमाने में उन्होंने अपनी जमीन जो ऊसर बंजर पड़ी थी भूदान में दे दी थी, सैकड़ों बीघा भूदान में दी थी और उसके बाद उनकी बीवी ने कोर्ट में यह हलफनामा किया कि मेरा पति पागल है और पागलपन के कारण उसने यह जमीन दी

[श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल]

है दान में। आपको शायद मालूम नहीं है कि आगरा के पागलखाने में ये रखे गये यह प्रूव करने के लिये कि वे पागल हैं और वह जमीन वापस मिलनी चाहिये और वह जमीन उनको वापस दी गई। अब वे लीडर इनको मिल गए। इनके लीडर एन. टी. आर. हैं इनके लीडर चौटाला है* देवीलाल हैं वे कितने हैं? इनके लीडर रामकृष्ण हेगड़े हैं जिनके बारे में कोर्ट वर्डिक्ट आ चुकी है। एन. टी. आर. के बारे में कोर्ट वर्डिक्ट आ चुकी है लेकिन उनको नहीं हटाया गया है... (व्यवधान)

**श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी :** क्या बात कर रहे हो तुम? इनकी जबान बंद कीजिये... *{Interruptions-*

**श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल :** जरा आप बैठिए। चौटाला का कैसा लेनदेन है?... अभी ज्योति बसु के बारे में... (व्यवधान)

**श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी:** जो समस्या है उसके बारे में कहो... (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down.

**श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी बात इन लोगों के चिल्लाने में चली गयी... (व्यवधान) तुम्हारा नेता* जो विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह को आप अपना नेता बनाकर बैठे हैं... (व्यवधान)* जनता दल चल रहा है, राम कृष्ण हेगड़े, देवी लाल जैसे * आदमी आपके नेता हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JA GESH DESASI): Please don't mention the names of those wh$_0$ cannot defend them selves here.

* Explained as ordered by the Chair.

**श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल :** यह तमाम अखबारों में पत्र-पत्रिकाओं में छपा है। ये झूठा आरोप लगा सकते हैं और हम क्या सही बात भी नहीं कह सकते। यह उस बात को सही नहीं कर सकते। मैंने आपको बताया कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह का चरित्र कैसा रहा है। मैंने आपको बताया कि उनकी बीवी ने कहा कि यह पागल है। इन्होंने भूदान में अपनी जमीन दे दी। उस जमीन को वापस लेने के लिये बीवी कहती है, एफिडेविट लगाती है कि यह पागल हैं। यह जाकर आगरे के पागलखाने में भी रहे हैं। दे गोट बैक द लैंड। आज 88 है सन् 86 में क्या हो रहा था.. (व्यवधान) जब वी. पी. सिंह यहां मंत्री थे तो पूरे एक सप्ताह उत्तर प्रदेश की असेम्बली नहीं चली। क्योंकि जनता दल, भारतीय जनता दल, लोक दल सब यह डिमांड कर रहे थे कि वी. पी. सिंह के खिलाफ इंक्वायरी बैठाई जाये, जांच कराई जाये राम जानकी ट्रस्ट, दहिया ट्रस्ट के बारे में। उस समय वीर बहादुर सिंह जी की सरकार थी। आज आप उसके चमचे बने हुये हैं (व्यवधान)। वह आपको ऐसी जगह ले जायेंगे जहां आपको पानी नहीं मिलेगा। (व्यवधान)

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: It is shame that after **all** those crimes he was taken into the Central Cabinet:

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Now **you** have formally taken him over.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: Who was responsible for that? So long as he was with you he was **all** right. *{Interruptions)*

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: W$_e$ would have been happy if you had accepted the demand of the Janata Party, Lok Dal or BJP of UP to institute an investigation against Mr. V. P. Singh. But at that time you supported Mr, V. P. Singh. You refuted the charge of the Opposition and gave him the promotion to the post of Finance Minister.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL. What about Jyoti Basu?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Don't talk about hii» Jyo:i Basu does not require certificate or otherwise from you.

SHRl P, N. SUKUL: He does .not re-qtiire_ s,

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: He does not re-qtii-e. You made Mr. Y. P. Singh De terge Minister in spite of all those charges. YOJ made him number two. We would hav$_s$ been happy if you had dismissed him, but you did not do thatl |

SHRI P. N. SUKUL. Mr. Dipen Ghosh, when you were speaking I did not disturb you. I did not do that. I was simply listening to you. (Interruptions) जब यह मंत्री रहे तो उस अपने मंत्रित्व काल में. (व्यवधान) many commercial apart-nasals did he acquire in Delhi? *(Interruptions )*

SHRI DTPEN GHOSH: Sir, we are not discussing Mr. V. P. Singh here. If you go tbraugh ihe Agenda, if says it is a brief discussion about the disclosures of pay ments.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: If it emanates from the statements of Mr. V. P. Singh references to him and his conduct will be made.

*.sta i* SHRI P. N SUKUL: It i$_s$ about an ex-Mfcister. v\ho does not file the annual returns of his assets Mr. Vice-Chairman, S'iT, . ..

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एक मिनट ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) आप बैठ जाइये ।

Mr. Sukul, are you yielding?

SHRI P. N SUKUL; I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He i$_s$ not yielding, please sit down.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : एक मिनट ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI JAGESH DESAI): H$_e$ has made it clear that iv is not yielding.

श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल : मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि जसवंत सिंह जी ने दो बातें कहीं थी दो बातें आपने ठीक कही हैं । जहां तक मैं समझ पाया पहली बात तो यह है कि उन्होंने हाउस को मिसलीड किया, गवर्नमेंट ने हाऊस को मिसलीड किया और दूसरी बात यह कही कि गिल्टी को पनिश नही किया । इनवेस्टीगेशन कम्पलीट नही हुआ है (व्यवधान) राजीव जी ने क्या कहा ? राजीव जी ने पहले तो अपनी सफाई दी क्योंकि उनके ऊपर चार्ज लगाया जा रहा था । उन्होंने हाऊस में कहा, वह रिकार्ड पर है, हमारा या हमारे परिवार का कोई आदमी इससे संबंधित नही है । दूसरी चीज यह कही कि कोई इण्डियन इससे संबंधित नही है । हमने इतना पता लगाया । अब कौन है यह पूरी छानबीन कर रहे हैं । जब कोई इण्डियन नही है और वह नहीं है और आप बार बार उन्ही के ऊपर इशारा कर रहे हैं और उनको लायर बता रहे हैं, झूठा बता रहे हैं, इस बात तरह से तो आप इस देश को रसातल में पहुंचा देंगे । इतना झूठ बोल कर थोड़े से राजनीतिक स्वार्थ के लिये आप देश के प्रधानमंत्री को जो प्रबल बहुमत से चुना हुआ है जिसको देश ने वहां पर बैठाया है आप छोटी छोटी बातों से आक्षेप लगा कर उनके ऊपर कीचड़ उछाल कर इस देश के लोकतंत्र के साथ, लोकतंत्र की जो संस्था है पार्लियामेंट इसके साथ अन्याय कर रहे हैं और स्वयं आप लोकतंत्र की जड़ खोद रहे हैं हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर (व्यवधान) इस पावन कार्य में आप लगे हुये हैं । जहां तक जांच करने और पनिश करने का सवाल है जिसकी बात आप कर रहे थे, यहां पर राजीव जी ने कहा हाई-पोथेटिकली मान लें कि ऐसा हुआ और उसको आप सही मान रहे हैं (व्यवधान) जहां तक इनवेस्टीगेशन का सवाल है I quote:

"Now the investigation is still conti nuing. The questions ____ we approached the Swiss also. The CBI approached the the Swiss. We started talking *up* them on a treaty. I believe only one other

[ श्री पशुपति नाथ सुकुल ]

country has such a treaty with them-that's United States And they agreed to have a treaty with us. The preliminary work is done. Now we are working oa the treaty. The treaty is going to take a little while. The last time I asked, they said it will take about a year. But that was about four or five months ago. So, perhaps by the beginning of next year, by the spring of next year, we should be in a position to sign a treaty with the Swiss on the samfe lines that the Americans have. But there is a basic problem with the Swiss: they dont tell :you anything unless there is an infringe-•ment of their laws."

When the Prime Minister was asked "And tax evasion isn't a crime there?" He said "No, it's very complicated. I wouldn't like to say a simple thing when the position is not. They say yes, when there is an income-tax violation. It is an offence but if this is the case it is not, if that is the case it is not...if that's the • • you know these are so many provisions and loopholes that it is difficult just quantify and say anything.

But we have taken it up with the Swiss, And we will continue to take it with the Swiss. We are really following it up now with the docu-. men's that were printed in the Hindu. In *i* case something does come out...."

That investigation is 6n. The CBI is go ing through the probe. We are going to have treaty with the Swiss and with the Swiss people so that all rhe relevant details th-at are supposed to be are finally known to us and then, only we will be in a '"osi-tion to bring those facts before the people, before the public and before the Parlia ment of India. | j

इसीलिये मैं कह रहा हूं जब तक यह जांच पूरी नहीं हो जाती, उसका अपना एक तरीका है, दूसरा देश इनवाल्व है, उनके लाज इन-वाल्व है, उनके सिक्रेट्स इनवाल्व हैं । जब तक यह जांच पूरी नहीं हो जाती और गिलटी का पता नहीं लग जाता तब तक इस तरह का अनर्गल प्रलाप न विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह को शोभा देता है और न आप सब को शोभा देता है । अगर आप इस चीज को बार-बार इसी तरह से करते हैं और बीच बीच में इस तरह से सरकार के ऊपर अटेक करते हैं . . . (व्यवधान) . . . अगर आपने ऐसा किया तो आप भारतीय लोकतंत्र के साथ अन्याय करेंगे और भारत की जनता के साथ अन्याय करेंगे । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं ।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARU-NACHALAM. Mr. Vice-Chairman. .Sir, I am not willing to repeat what mv lion. friends from, thi; side expressed regarding Bofors deal. But 1 would like to reiterate the allegations preferred by them. The mos. important issues for the consideration of the House are, whether commission was paid by Bofors or not' who were the real recipients of commission; what are the set-vices rendered by three agencies, Svenska, Moresco and A.E. services; whether defence of Bofors that it has paid up only winding up cos.* is acceptable; and whether there is involvement of our Prime Minister in this big scandal? Sir, right from the beginning, this Government, under the leadership of our Prime Minister, has been denying the ch-.irges by saying that there is no payment of commission, there are no middlemen and there is no involvement of our Prime Minister, Sir, on various occasions, our Prime Minisler had assured the House that if there was any proof, he was prepared to take action. Sir, I would like to remind this House of various utterances of our Prime Minister on 20th Apri] 1987 in Lok Sabha. With yoiir permission, I would like to quote:

•'You show us any evidence, we do not want proof. We will bring the proof. You show us any evidence that there has been involvement of the middlemen of pay-off or bribe or commission. We will take action. We will see t'nat nobody however high-up, is allowed to go free."

Sir,, our Rrim$_9$ Minister was very em* tiofpA and rhetoric on that occasion. Now, he is| very reluctant to face th«Jacts. Unfortunately, the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Bofors issue endorsed blindly all the stances taken by the Government and our Prime Minister. That is why, I say... *(Interruption).*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. I do not think you should say like this.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Why? I have every right to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no. It is $_a$ represen--tatjve Committee.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: What did I'say?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAT): You said that the Joint Parliamentary Committee has taken whatever the Government wants to take.

SHRl ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Yes, it has endorsed the staace taken by the Government. That is my t.ew. What is unparliamentary oi illogical in it? *(Interruption)..*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, I cannot allow it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Is it not a fact that the JTP.C. report had endorsed the Government view ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI); No, no. It is an allegation against the Committee. Th$_e$ Government may be thinking on those lines. You cannot say like this. *(Interruption)..*

SHRT DARBARA SINGH: He might be a blind man in our Committee. But we were with open eyes.

§HRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: After the publication of the Joint Parliamentary Committee report on Bofors issue, so many authentic documents have been pubESBed by the 'Hindi:' and other newspapers. Sir, now th* defence preferred by the Government has collapsed like a house of cards. I would like to say that this is an information from authentic sources. Now, the Government is not in a position to dispute the veracity of the document published by the 'Hindu' and produced by hon. leader, Mr. V. P. Singh. Now, you have ordered for investigation to find out the veracity of the documents. Now, you raise certain doubts. You have every right to raise doubts. But, Sir, the document was published by 'The Hindu' on June 23rd, 26tb or something like that. So far you have taken six months to find out or examine the veracity of the document. For the information of this House, I would like to say that at first, Bofors refused to disclose the names of the recipients. After great pressure, it came forward to disclose thre$_e$ names. The Prime Minister and the External Affairs Ministry were informed. Subsequently, the Joint Parliamentary Committee was informed. Sir, the Joint Parliamentary Committee, after receiving. ..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : You are reopening the whole history.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Please let me say what I want to. *(Intemiptions).* After receiving these three names, it asked th$_e$ CBI to examine th$_e$ nature and the functions of the three agents. Svenska, Moreno and A.E. Services. Sir, I am to inform this House th;it within two months the CBI submitted its report to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But you have taken mov$_e$ than month., to examine thei veracity of the document produced by "The Hindu'. Why is there abnormal delay? The Defence Minister may please answer thi* question Then, Sir. we produced some documents. Mr. V. P. Singh has produced some documents r.nd 'The Hindu' has produced some dqcujnents.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JA GESH DESAI): Mr. V. P. Singh's docu ments are quite different. j -

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Whatever it is. He has published. *(Interruptions).* My point is, you are disputing them. To jstablish that there was a commission, to establish that there was an agent, to establish that there was involvement of bigwigs, we produce these documents. Now, defence saying that theie is no commission^ there is only winding-up charge. I ask the Minister: Ace you prepared to prove that there was only payment of winding-up costs by showing any draft or any cheque? Normally, only in trade, business, invoices are utilised. But for settling the account, we know well, the amount will be paid either by cheque or by draft. I am prepared to accept your argument. Let the Defence Minister or the Prime Minister produce the Zerox copy of the cheques or drafts given by Bofors to the various agents. '

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI):" How does the Government come into the picture?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: You have accused. You have to produce the evidence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Aladi Aruna... *(Interruption)*

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: When I am capable enough to produce something to establish may argument, claim, why ca.n you not? You are having the machinery with you. Then, Sir, Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan has told the House lhat Mr. V. P. Singh has signed in the document here and there. I am to remind the House that this Bofors contract was absolutely, exclusively, dealt with by the Defence Ministry under the chairmanship of the Defence Secretary, not by the Finance Ministry. The responsibility of the Finance""Ministry is to see whether the contract has been' reached within the allotted amount. It has no right to examine, it has no conventional practice to examine the merits of the system or the technical evaluation certificate. It is not the duty j of the Finance Ministry. *(Interruptions),* '

If the Finance Ministry is not answerable, if there is any advantage or disadvinfage or any merit or defect, the entire 'thiug with go to the Defence Ministry.

SHRl CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Even for a small quantity of foreign exchange, the Finance Ministry has te approve of it.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: The awarding of the contract is not the duty of the Finance Miois-try. It is under the chairmanship of the Price Negotiating Committee under the chairmanship of the Defence Secretary. 1 would like to repeat, repeatedly the Government claims that because of the direct negotiation we are benefitted to the extent of Rs. 19.25 crores. This is a fraudulent claim. The Government conveniently preferred thej date 10th February. What is the offer of Bofors? Tenth January. The Offer of Bofors was Rs. 1,437 crores. If you calculate the offer of Bofors from January, you are benefited only by Rs. 10 crores, nothing more than that. Therefore, the claim of Rs. 192 crores is a fraud on the part of the Government. Right from the beginning our Government unfortunately supports the stance of Bofors. First no bribe, no commission, lt was endorsed by the Government. Then the Government itself was unaware of the winding up costs at the time of reaching the contract. Bofors had never spoken anything about it. Only after pressure from political parties the Government itself came to know about the winding up charges and the Genernment started saying, 'Yes, it is winding up costs'. Now there is authentic proof that there is payment of commission there are middlemen. And what does the Prime Minister say now? He says if there 15 commission it is for genuine service. What does it mean? Even the commission is proved. Our Prime Minister justifies In-misleading of Bofors, the stance of Bofors. Where was the need for the Prime Minister to justify even the hypothetical payment of commission? Only becaus* the Government is afraid ^f Bofors, on'y because the Government is a party to Hie Bofors deal. Tt is a shame to the nation

that a person "who is leading the nation is alleged with a commission of Rs. 65 crores. With thes© words I conclude. -

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr Vice-Chairman, the publication of certain documents relating to the Bofors contract by THE HrNDU in Jung this year bad injected some psychotropic drug in the body of the opposition resulting in a euphoria' which we had witnessed on a number oi occassions during the preceding year and a half. However, a similar debate that followed the publication of the documents was totally lack-lustre; and the Opposition was convinced of the futility of their allegation when the honour-Table Minister of Defence very brilliantly demolished their case. At that time defeat and resignation were writ large *on their* faces. Tfierefore the Opposition was desperately looking for an issue to fight Ihe Government. That is understandable and is the right of the Opposition also. Unfortunately when they failed to do so on political grounds, they resorted to Iheir eld game of disinformation and misleading the people of the country to create disaffection against the Government, a popularly elected Government, against which they could,' possibly find nothing otherwise.

Today's debate emanates from some press conferences of Shri V. P. Singh, Ihe new-found messiah of the Oppostion. Sir, when Shri V. P. Singh found that the halo that he had sought to create around himself was shattering, when he found that his own associates in the Jana Morcha and elsewYiere were losing confidence in him, and when he found that those associates of him were-privately using highly derogratory and perhaps true words about him, he thought that the compulsions of the situation were such that he had to take some action to draw attraction of the people. By raising a false aid baseless allegation that a part of the alleged kickbacks in the Bofors deal stands deposited in a Swiss bank in the name of tfoe Prime Minister, Shri V. P. Singh has drawn attraction all right But, in the process, he has found the mask on his face falling down a claimant to the exalted public morality platform, his politics of blackmail, of deceit, of ckica-nery stand abundantly exposed. Having found some success in the past, *in* seems to have taken people's guilibiltyl for granted. In these Press conferences which he addressed a few days back, be first claimed that he had fresh evidence in his possession about the payment erf kickbacks, etc. in the Bofors deal. Sub-sequently, he retracted hi? words t> say that his statement was based on the "Hindu" document itself. Sir, if a perrson professedly as senior as Mr. V. P. Singh claims to be i>i possession of suci conclusive evidence, for which friends on the other side accord to him, that credibility, it was imperative for him, when he levelled an allegation as serious ag that, and he was duty-bound, to disclose that evidence to the countrymen. It is a different matter an preposterous to simply say that he corroborates what he had ®*4 Today, having said what he has saii, Sir, he is in a predicament. But beins, as I said, a master of chicanery, he wouli definitely go to any extent in perpetuating any amount of falsehood to preserve, to maintain, ostensibly t'ne apparent truth about his earlier falsehoods. What the country expects of him today is that he should come out with any evidence that he has with him. He has various platforms available for that including the Parliament. But to say that he would disclose the corroborative evidence, at the appropriate time only shows the malific thinking of hrs and it only shows that a charge like this is levelled malicrously to keep the controversy alive.

Sir, our thought today goes back to the moment when the issue was first ri'iscd in Parliament. As I would not like to irepeat in details what the honourable Members have said before me. I would only very briefly say that it was deliberately and mischievously that the Opposition took the decision not to associate itself v. ite. the JPC. They knew that if they joined the JPC. they would not be left in any position to challenge the findings of the JPC subsequently. They knew the truth of the matter. They know that the Gov. ernment of India went in fcr the Iwst btry.

[ Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

tbft Fe got the best guns at tht most cqippctilive price's. But bereft of all the issues, they want to keep this issue aliye. And to keep this issue alive, they periodically want the entire focuts of the people en this issue of Bofors, and in doing so ihey are totally unmindful ol the othe- important issues which await discussion by Parliament. We have had t'ne severest of floods in Punjab and elsewhere recently. The Government has come fepward with a perspective plan for women. These perhaps are of no concern to them. -Ani permit me to say, Sir, that even issues involved in the matter relat-ing to Bofors contract do not really interest them. AU that interests them is to keep tbe issue alive till the next elections bacause ihey are flabbergasted by the progress that this country has made under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. They kno>v that various schemes have been launched from time to time fcr alleviation *oi* poverty in the conntry, for the welfare of weaker sections of society, and they have nothings really strong to light the Government. In this process, *Sr,* thty continue to grope in the dark, stiil Bol being able to overcome the great *shock* they received when they were mauled fcy the Congress at the elections four yeare back.

"Sir; the Opposition parties, I admit, have a glut of leaders. But, unfortunately, thsy lack leadership. So any discard of the Gongress is welcome in their fold. He becomes their leader till the people of the country throw him to the dustbin of history. Today that role is sought to be .played by Shri V. P. Singh. Shri V. P. Singh perhaps sees a faint, but I must say; a deceptive, ray of hope to acquire the top-mat position in the country. For that he does not mind the compny of CIA's Hershrnan or the likes of Haji Mastan.

Srr, on the other hand, his new associates in the Janata Dal and the so calted Natice&I Front continue to use him with the malicious design to embarrass the Government till the time comes when they are able to overthrow him.

Sir, as the initiator of today's diapussioa,. Mr. Gurupadaswamy, said; *th/t* basic «*-•sue in the Bofors matter is wharJur any kickbacks were involved in the transaction, whether any money was paid iu what, ever form to influence the contract. Unfortunately, Sir, this debate like I many other debates in the past hag deteriorated to an exercise in semantics. Muaa has been said as to what a 'commission' K as to what winding-up charge' is, as to what we mean by 'hypothetical' and. various other words like genuine work.' that have cropped up during the debate. Sir, I have said that earlier. Fortunately, toiay I ly ve Mr. Dipen Ghosh present in ihe Hous^. So, I must pay that com-plinitnt to km. I admit that his intellec-ui.ii pi'vor is gre.*. But it is iny feeling that his opinion about himself is greater and that sometimes overtakes the former. Sir, today he was dwelling at length on the Prime Minister's interview to the mafiazioge 'Sunday'. Certain important things which form the crux of the matter were conveniently ignored by him. As yoa all know, it is ? long interview, a can did interview, by the Prime Minister. As usual, being a believe in an op;n form of Government, he has not concealed anything. He is responding to the querie^ with an open mind of the gentleman who represented the 'Sunday' for this interview. But, Sir, we must mark the words when hes ays: "The question is to whom and for what the payment was made". If it was paid for some genuine work that was done for Bofors, then we cannot question it. What is wrong with it? The Joint Parlia-mentary Committee has come to a clear finding that no kickback were involved ia

the matter. As you know, about 64 crores of rupees did pass hands. If the Prime Minister raises a hypothetical question with a pressman and argues—hypothetical -ly. for the purpose of argument—thai if this money were to be used hy Bofors for making some sort of payment which is-not connected with the clinching of the contract, then what is wrong with it, and how can we question it even if jt is wrong? We know that French SOFMA and the Swedish Bofors were in a keen run as far as the purchase of 155mm Howitzer gun by India was concerned. The two

firms also knew it. Alongwith these two firms, there four or five other, firms in the run. If one or two or ail the*e competitors hav$_e$ their men in other coun tries trying to know what are the qualities of the gun being offered by that parti cular country to the prospective purchaser and how ca$_n$ they match or excel that in the production of their, weapon, what fault can we find with that? If you extent the argument of the Opposition, tomorrow they would go to the extent of saying that Bofors has paid so much money to its lawyers that it has paid | so much money to its engineers. Well, that money must have[1] been out of the receipts of this contract. Sir, this is a ridiculous argument. The question that we are concerned with—I say so and I repeat it to lay emphasis on it—is whether any money passed hands to influence the purchase of the gun by us. If this ha$_s$ not been done, then as to what the Bofors have done with their money—not only these 64 crores of Rupees but with the 1600 crores of iiipees—is non$_e$ of our business. All that we are concerned with is whether any part of that money has in anyform come back to India, whethsr to Indians or to non-resident Indians, and whether any provision of any Indian law has been violated. If that has happened, we are obviously concerned about it. Sir, not *on* one but on umpteen occasions, the Prime Minister and the Government have reiterated their commitment to find that out. A reference has been repeatedly made to the Prime Minister's speech on 20th April last year in Lok Sabha. Sir, he had said, "Give us the evidence and we will act*'. H$_e$ does not go back on those words. Mr. Aladi Aruna has said that the Prime Minister was then emotive, but today he is finding it difficult to defend those words. That is a travesty of truth, Sir. He was emotive then, h$_e$ was sincere, he was honest about it and remains so today. Give us the evidence as the Pirime Minister | has said, the Government would act on it. But be responsible and give evidence. Don't only point an accusing finger, don't only say, it is the Prime Minister 'himself, who has cornered this amount. And when the Prime Minister comes to the House to refute such a baseless allegation, our friends here have the audacity to say—they lament over his coming that he had to defend himself. It is not the prime Minister, it is not the Government which hav$_e$ created a situation as that. Unfortunately, lit is the Olppfosi-tion who by their mendacious allegations, by their baseless accusation have created a situation where the Prim$_e$ Minister of the country has to come and say that he is not involved in this, that no member of his family is involved or that he has no account in any foreign country, lt is not the question of a particular incumbent to the office of Prime Minister. It is the question of preserving the dignity and the honour of an exalted offic$_e$ like that oi the Prime Minister of a country as India. If our friends, in their anxiety to level all sorts of allegations against th$_e$ Government, are' falling in a trap or working according to the machination's, wittingly or unwittingly of ■ the powers that are hostile to use, of powers that want tQ weaken India, I think, there is something seriously wrong about their functioning and it is time they go in for some out of self-intro'spection to find as td where the malady lies and take immediate remedial measures.

Sir, I would lik$_e$ to say only one thing before I conclude. Much mud h$^f$s bee$_n$ thrown at the leadership of the country in some vain hope that by doing so at least some mud would stick to the leadership, to Rajiv Gandhi, the Prim$_e$ Minister of India, who during tbis short period of four years of stewardship of the country has taken the country to a position of envy in the comity of nations, who has taken the country to a position of respect which i$_s$ acknowledged by all the world leaders.

Sir, it has been said by many of my friends about the way the mind of Shri V. P. Singh has been working in the past. I hope we do not have him today in a state of mind rn wWcn he once was said to be when he had given a large chunk of his land in Bhoodan Movement. If that were to be • the situation today, if somebody were to raise pre-sumptions a$_s$ that, that is really bad for the country. Sir, for his baseless allegations, I would not raise a demand as

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

niy hon. Colleagues from this side have done by asking him to take Sanyas. Let us be sure that he is doing all that hi is doing not to take Sanyas notwithstanding the public appearances in the form of Mahatma Gandhi or JP. Sir, it is to attain that goal, to attain that position of power that we see all thes$_e$ forms of intrigues and angling from there. 1 would only say that India is safe in the hands of Rajiv Gandhi. If there is an overwhelming majonyt of the people of ihe country who have placed their destiny in hi$_s$ hands, it will be useful if V. P. Singh and his likes observe a period of silence. Thank you.

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार की असफलता के कारण बोफोर्स कांड में जो नाजायज कमीशन लिया गया, उसकी उचित जांच नहीं हो सकी इसलिये सदन में बार-बार इसी बिन्दु पर हम लोग बहस कर रहे हैं और पिछले 18 महीने से हम लोग इस पर काफी समय दे रहे हैं । अभी शासक पार्टी के लोगों के भाषण सुनने का मौका मिला । उन्होंने कुछ बातें कहीं उसका सारांश है कि एक तो इस बहस में कुछ नयी बात नहीं है, ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी ने जांच की, इसके बाद कोई नई बात नहीं है इसमें, दूसरी बात यह है कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह के पागलपन के कारण या भ्रष्टाचार के कारण यह सब बात हो रही है और तीसरी बात यह कि आप विपक्ष के लोग वोट के लिये ऐसा कर रही हैं । ये ही तीन बातें सुनने को मिलीं । अब पहली बात हम कहना चाहेंगे कि विश्व नाथ प्रताप सिंह क्या हैं, नहीं है, वह आप हमसे ज्यादा जानते हैं क्योंकि आप के साथ वह ज्यादा दिन रहे हैं । आपको जो कहना है, कह लीजिये, अब आपका दूसरा नेता भी चला जायेगा उसके बारे में भी यही कहेंगे, हम तो इस पर रोक नहीं लगाते । हमको एक घटना याद आती है । हमारी बस्ती में एक बार एक आदमी के यहां मेहमान आया, वह मेहमान बहरा था, सुनता नहीं था । तो उसको घर वालों ने पूछा कि क्या खाइयेगा तो वह बोला कि मेरे चार पुत्र है । फिर घर वाले ने पूछा कि आप मांस-मछली खाते हैं कि नहीं तो उसने कहा कि हम परसों चले जायेंगे । तो वही शासक पार्टी कह रही है । सवाल है यहां कि बोफोर्स कांड में देश का धन किसने गोलमाल किया है, बजाय इसके लिये इस पर विचार करें आप विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह की बात करते है, उस बहरे की तरह और आप लोग समझते हैं कि हम लोग आपकी बात को मान लेंगे । हम लोग तो राजीव गांधी के होलिया नहीं है । हमको आप लोग कन्विन्स कर सकते है तथ्यों के जरिये, ढोल बजा कर नहीं ।

**श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग** (गुजरात) : बहरा नहीं, पागल कहिये ।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र :** हमने कह दिया, आप नहीं थे । अगर वह पागल है तो इसी बहाने आप कोर्ट से फ्री हो जाइये कि पागल आदमी को डाक्यूमेंट पेश करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है । **(व्यवधान)**

अब बात है कि इसमें नई बात है कि नहीं है । ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी के बाद दो बात नई इसमें है। एक तो हिन्दू के कारसपान्डेंट ने जो बात लिखी, पता लगाया और दूसरा विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने जो यह कहा कि दिसम्बर, 1986 में जो लोटस कम्पनी के दस्तावेज में यह लिखा कि यदि संभव हो तो भेजने वाले का नाम न लिखा जाये । यह भी एक नई बात है और दोनों मिलकर एक अत्यन्त खतरनाक बात हो जाती है । हमारे सदन के नेता श्री शिव शंकर आ उठे और हिन्दू के कारसपान्डेंट को बधाई दे दी बिना यह सोचे समझे कि अगर हिन्दू के कारसपान्डेंट को बधाई देते हैं तो इस गवर्नमेंट को कन्डम्न कीजिये कि नालायक गवर्नमेंट है । एक पत्रकार जो पता लगा सकता है यह सरकार सारे साधन होते हुये भी पता नहीं

लगा सकी । यहां खतरा यह उपस्थित है कि प्रधानमंत्री यह कह सकते हैं कि औद्योगिक इन्टेलीजेंस के लिये कमीशन लिया गया लेकिन हम लोगों को खतरा यह है कि हमारे देश में जब एक पर एक जासूसी कांड पकड़ा जा रहा है तब अगर ऐसा कमीशन दिया जाता है, और हमारे लोगों को खरीदा जाता है तो देश पर भी, उसके संविधान पर यह भारी खतरे का मसला है । जो सवाल है उस पर तो आप विचार कीजिए, आप उस घटना पर विचार नहीं करते हैं । आप कहते हैं कि हम लोग वोट के लिये ऐसा कर रहे हैं । ऐसा होता है आप भी वोट के लिये ऐसा काम करते हैं, यह 7.00 P.M. बात किसी से छिपी हुई नहीं है । लेकिन अखबार वालों को क्या जरूरत पड़ी है आपके खिलाफ लिखने की ? वे तो वोट के लिये नहीं खड़े होंगे । सारे देश के अखबार लिख रहे हैं, एक दो नहीं, आपके जो खिलाफ हैं वे ही नहीं लिख रहे हैं । जो आपकी फैमिली के अखबार हैं, मंडे के कारसपोंडेंट ने जितने भी संबंधित प्रश्न पूछे हैं, जो भी छपा है वे आपके ही अखबार हैं । वह ऐसे सवाल कर रहे है जो यह साबित करता है आपका इस भ्रष्टाचार में कुछ न कुछ संबंध है । अगर हमारे अखबार में आता, कम्युनिस्ट अखबार में आता तो उसको आप छोड़ दीजिये । लेकिन मेरे पास 15 नवम्बर का इकानामिक टाइम्स है । इलाहाबाद जाकर आपने देख लिया और आगे देखना है तो रूकिये । हमारी बात आप नहीं सुनते है, हमारी बात आपको पसन्द नहीं आती है तो इलाहाबाद की आवाज सुनिये और उसके लिये देश तैयार है । मैं नई स्थिति के संबंध में उसके संपादकीय से आपको पढ़कर सुना देना चाहता हूं :

There is a further issue of some mportance. The Prime Minister's state-nent, on the nature of the payments Lave done a great harm to his credi-u'lity."

देश के लोग कह रहे है कि प्रधान मंत्री की क्रेडिबिलिटी बहुत तेजी से गिरती जा रही है और मैं अपनी ओर से आपसे कहूंगा कि हमारे देश में एक भी ऐसा प्रधान मंत्री नहीं हुआ था, जिसकी क्रेडिबिलिटी इतनी नीचे चली गई हो । आपको मानना है तो मान सकते हैं, नहीं मानना है तो यह आपके ऊपर है । यह क्या लिखता है :

"From no payment of any money to any person in connection with the contract, the country has been led through winding up charges td what is wrong with commission paid for some genuine work!...."

ये सारी बातें कौन लोग पूछ रहे हैं, इनका जवाब देना चाहिये । संपादकीय में आखिर में लिखा है .

"... . What prevents the Prime Minister from ordering a fresh and independent enquiry in the wake of disclosures made by *The Hindu* and now by Mr. V. P. Singh? That would be far more graceful on his part than encouraging his minions to indulge in a slanging match of counter allegations which makes a further dent in the credibility of the ruling party."

अगर आप यही चीज चाहते हैं तो हम आपको रोक नहीं सकते लेकिन हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि देश की इस नाजुक घड़ी में जब अखबारों में एक राष्ट्रीय अहम का प्रश्न उठाया गया है तो आप ढोलिया का काम मत कीजिए । प्रधान मंत्री भी ऐसी गंभीर बात पर इस तरह क्यों बोलते हैं । तरह-तरह की बातें क्यों बोल देते हैं ? बोलते समय कोई ख्याल ही नहीं करते ? प्रधानमंत्री कहते हैं कि वह सबसे अच्छे ढंग से सरकार चला रहे हैं । कोई विश्वास करेगा कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू और इंदिरा गांधी से अधिक अच्छे ढंग से वे सरकार चला रहे हैं ? आप कुछ भी बोलिए लेकिन ढोलिया इस वीटर के अलावा कोई इन बातों पर विश्वास नहीं करेगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय प्रधान मंत्री ने मिस्टर क्लीन से शुरू किया था । हमको लगता है कि वे डर्टियेस्ट प्रधान मंत्री होने जा रहे हैं । पहले के सभी प्रधान मंत्री हमारी कोशिशों से सफेद नहीं हो गए । आप उनको पूजते रहिए ढोल पीटते रहिए ।

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

कुछ बातें ऐसी हैं जिनको साफ करना चाहिए । बोफोर्स से खरीदगी में कमीशन लिया गया यह अब स्पष्ट है लेकिन पहले से सरकार हमको नहीं कहती है स्वीडिश रेडियो कहता है कि तुम्हारा रुपया चोरी चला गया । हिन्दू अखबार क्यों कहेगा सरकार क्यों नहीं कहेगी ? विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह क्यों कहते हैं ? हिन्दू में पब्लिश होने के बाद पहले सरकार सदन में क्यों नहीं आई कि अभी-अभी जो बातें प्रकाशित हुई हैं ये खतरनाक बातें हैं। बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों की चालें हमको पता नहीं लग रही हैं, आइए हम सब मिलकर इसका पता लगाएं । यह ऐटीट्यूड आप नहीं ले रहे हैं । आप लाइयर बन रहे हैं । आपके कहने से लगता है कि बिना कमीशन के गन अच्छे नहीं मिल सकती हैं । इसलिए जो मुख्य मुद्दे हैं उनको आप नहीं लेते हैं उनके मुताबिक काम नहीं करते हैं । सदन को जो आश्वासन दिया था वह प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया था। हम कहते हैं आज जो हमारे सदन के नेता बोले हैं हम चाहेंगे रक्षा मंत्री जी उसको साफ करें वह गलत बात है। गवर्नमेंट का डिसिजन यह है कि कोई भी मिडिल मेन इस सौदेबाजी में उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं करेगा । आज उन्होंने कहा है नहीं यह नहीं है उसमें । उसमें यह है कि जुनुइन काम के लिए मिडिल मैन किया जायेगा यह किस गवर्नमेंट का डाकुमेंट है ? अगर है तो सदन के सामने रख दें तब हम लोग नहीं बोलेंगे ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Shiv Shanker bas not said like that. He said that this is what has appeared in the article, in the interview.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: This is what he said.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: You are not to interpret,

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTA CHARJEE: The Chai, Should not inter pret.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: raised the question, what is the Gov ernment order. The whole thing arises out of the good thing done by Mr Rajiv Gandhi that no middlemen will b* used and no commission will he paid for this purpose. This was good on his part. What has happened? This has been violated and certain things have taker place. And you people are defending it This further confuse, the people and creates suspicion in the minds of the people that you are the sharer in thai commission.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTA CHARJEE; Shareholder.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Shareholder or not will be decided latei on.

मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि नवभारत टाइम्स में प्रधान मंत्री ने दिया था कि विदेशों में जिन लोगों ने गैर कानूनी ढंग से धन जमा किया हुआ है उन सब पर हम सख्त कार्रवाई करेंगे । आप बताइये किस पर सख्त कार्रवाई आपने की है । अगर आप नहीं करते तो क्या हम नहीं कहेंगे कि झूठा आश्वासन दिया है । आप नहीं करना चाहते तो मत करिये । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि पार्लियामेंट से सैक्शन 105 सी०आर० पी० सी० को आपने अमेंडमेंट करा लिया । यह जायज किया आपने । अमेंडमेंट करने के बाद क्या किया आपने ? आपने कहा ऐसे लोगों पर केस करेंगे । अगर आपने केस इंस्टीट्यूट किया होता तो स्विस बैंक या स्विडिश गवर्नमेंट मजबूर होती क्रिमिनल केस में सारी बातें कहने पर सारी चीजें सामने आ जातीं । आपने केस नहीं किया । किसी पर केस नहीं किया तो क्यों सैक्शन 105 अमेंड किया । कोई भी काम आपने नहीं किया यही हमारी चार्ज है और आप इसको छिपाने हैं सारी चीजें सप्रेस करते हैं ।

हमारा दूसरा चार्ज यह है कि रक्षा मंत्री इसको साफ करें कि 17 दिसम्बर को भारत सरकार और स्विटजरलैंड के बीच एक समझौता हुआ कि जिन लोगों

ने इस तरह से नजायज धन जमा किया है उनको डिटेक्ट करने में दोनों सरकारें एक दूसरे की सहायता करेंगी । इसको एक साल से ज्यादा हो गया लेकिन कुछ नहीं हुआ । अगर आप सारा कारेसपोंडेंस हम लोगों के सामने रखते तो हम कन्वीस हो जाते कि आपने कोशिश की है और हम आप पर एलीगेशन नहीं लगायेंगे । अगर छिपाते चले जायेंगे और सेक्शन 105 के मुताबिक कोई काम नहीं किया तो क्यों नहीं हम डाउट करेंगे । 17 दिसम्बर को भारत और स्विटजरलैंड के बीच समझौता करके आप कोई कार्रवाई नहीं करते तब हम क्यों नहीं शक करेंगे । निश्चय कहेंगे आपने छिपाया है । चोर लोगों को छिपाया है । इसीलिए दरपेश सवाल यह है और हम यह जानना चाहेंगे कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री अगर कम उम्र के हैं वह नहीं समझ सकते तो क्या आपकी पार्टी में कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं है जो उनको जाकर यह कह सके कि यह मामला एक सौ करोड़ का नहीं है मामला है प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर काली छाया पड़ने का । यह इस देश में कभी नहीं हुआ । यह अत्यन्त खतरनाक है । यह आपकी प्रतिष्ठा के लिए घातक है सारे देश के लिए भी घातक है । अभी उन्होंने 500 करोड़ नहीं 800 करोड़ की बात कही है। 800 करोड़ की क्या ज्यादा कीमत है प्रधान मंत्री की इज्जत से । क्यों नहीं आप इस पर कार्रवाई करते ?

अब बात आती है बोफोर्स की कि कार्रवाई करनी चाहिए या नहीं करनी चाहिए और करनी चाहिए तो कैसी करनी चाहिए । हम लोगों का यह कहना है कि उसका पता लगाने के लिए बोफोर्स ने जो आपका आदेश था अच्छा आदेश था उसको वायलेट किया । अगर वायलेशन के चार्ज पर हम उस कान्ट्रेक्ट टरमिनेट करेंगे या ब्लैकलिस्ट करेंगे तो दुनिया की कोई भी कोर्ट इसको नजायज नहीं कहेगी क्योंकि आपने पहले ही कह दिया था कि कोई कान्ट्रेक्ट का मिसयूज नहीं होना चाहिए मिडिल मैन नहीं होना चाहिए । अगर उन्होंने किया है तो यह नजायज है । हम इस पर एक्शन ले सकते हैं । आप लोग और प्रधान मंत्री कहते है कि देश का रुपया बचाने के लिए हम ऐसा करते हैं । हनको ऐसा लगता है कि उस लड़की की तरह सरकार सफाई दे रही है जो इलिसिट कनेक्शन में थी किन्तु बार-बार छिपाये जाती थी कि इलिसिट कनेक्शन है । लेकिन जब डिलीवरी का दिन आया तो पर्दा उठ गया । तो अभी आपकी डिलीवरी हो रही है । सुन लीजिए हमारी बात । रक्षा मंत्री जी आपको पसंद न हो तो कह दीजिए कि बकवास करके चले गये । फिर नाम प्रकाशित होगा । आप नहीं खोज पाइयेगा । इसमें दूसरे लोग इन्वोल्ड हैं । आप लोग छोटे आदमी हैं । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय जिन-जिन कम्पनियों का सौदा नहीं लिया गया है वे सभी इसमें लगी हुई हैं । वे ही कागजात निकालती हैं वे ही छाप करके देंगी । यह तो हर जगह बिजिनेस होता है । इसीलिए कल चल करके नाम छापा जायेगा । इलेक्शन नजदीक आने दीजिए नाम भी आ जायेगा । तब फिर आप ढोल लेकर बजाते चलिएगा कि आप लोग झूठ कह रहे हैं आप लोग झूठ कह रहे हैं । सावधान हो जाइये । हम आपको अभी भी कह रहे है गलतियों से सबक लीजिए । देखने की कोशिश कीजिए ।

आखिर में अखबार जो निकला है उसके बारे में एक अण्डर कोटेशन है इसलिए मैं उसको पढ़कर सुना देता हूं यह "इंडियन एक्सप्रेस" के उस लेख से है।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई)** : यह नूरानी के आर्टिकिल से है ।... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र** : हां हमारा दूसरा विषय है । पूरा आर्टिकल तो मैं पढ़ नहीं सकता हूं । एक पहलू है जिसको रक्षा मंत्री जी साफ करें अगर कार्य किये हुए हैं तो :

"On July 20 the spokesman of tho Swiss Justice Department said that Switzerland was willing to provide the required assistance but till date we have not received any request from India concerning this case."

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

यह विदिन इन्वेस्टेड कामा है । अगर गलत है तो अखबार पर आ.प केस चला सकते थे । कोई रोकता तो नहीं । आपने कहा कि भूदान की सारी जमीन विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह जी की पत्नी ने अपने शौहर को पागल करार देकर हड़प कर रख ली। उन्होंने तो पब्लिकली दे दिया, उन पर केस चलाते हुए । लेकिन आपको क्या हो रहा है । हमको दूसरी बात लग रही है । जब यह चोरी पकड़ी जा रही है, यह हम नहीं कह रहे है कि आप ही चोर हैं यह हमने नहीं कह ... (व्यवधान)

**प्रो० सौरीन्द्र भट्टाचार्य** : अभी तक नहीं बोल रहे हैं ।

**श्री चतुरानन मिश्र** : हमने कहा कि आप उनके शागिर्द हो सकते हैं ऐसी स्थिति हो गयी है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय एक जगह ऐसा हुआ कि एक चोर पकड़ा गया (व्यवधान) जस्ट मैं कन्क्लूड करता हूं । एक चोर पकड़ा गया तो चोर ही हल्ला करने लगा "चोर", "चोर", इतना हल्ला किया कि सब भागकर उधर चले गये । अब सरकार की चोरी पकड़ने लगी है तो तो आप ही हल्ला कर रहे हैं कि विश्वनाथ जी चोर हैं, ये चोर है वो चोर है । अगर चोर हैं तो पकड़ कर जेल में रखो । हम आपको कहने जायें तब ना, कि आपने उनको क्यों पकड़ कर रख दिया ? आपको कोई रोकता तो नहीं है । यह बात न करके आप उल्टी बात कर रहे हैं । पहले अपने हाथ साफ कीजिये तब इंसाफ मांगिये । अगर अपने हाथ में बघनखा रखेंगे तो फिर आपको इंसाफ नहीं मिलेगा । इसलिये अंतिम बात कहकर समाप्त करता हूं कि अगर गवर्नमेंट यह बात साबित नहीं करती है जो 17 सितम्बर का एग्रीमेंट हुआ था हमारे और स्विटजरलैंड के बीच में और जिसके मुताबिक फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने लोक सभा में कहा था कि अब कार्यवाही की जा सकती है, उसके मुताबिक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की गयी, अगर सी०आर०पी०सी० के अमेंडमेंट के मुताबिक कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई और अगर यह सच बात है जैसा कि 20 जुलाई को स्विस डिपार्टमेंट ने कहा कि इंडिया के केस परस्यू नहीं किया तब हम आपसे मांग करते हैं कि आपकी सरकार इस्तीफा दे, आप नालायक है, आप राज चलाने के लायक नहीं है । हम ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बैठा करके क्या करेंगे अगर आप सारी चीजों को छिपा रहे हैं और अगर यही स्थिति है । हमारा दूसरा सुझाव होगा कि सब आपोजीशन वालों की मीटिंग बुलाइये और कहिये कि यह राष्ट्रीय महत्व की घटना घटी है, सभी मिलकर इसका रास्ता निकालें । यह तभी होगा जब ईमानदारी से आप चीजों को प्रस्तुत करेंगे । अभी जो आप कर रहे हैं वह सारी चीजों को छिपा रहे हैं, इसीलिये आपकी यह कार्यवाही निन्दात्मक है । धन्यवाद ।

**श्री दरबारा सिंह (पंजाब)** : वाइस चेयरमैन साहब,

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई)** : केवल 10 मिनट ।

**श्री दरबारा सिंह** : बहुत कुछ सुना मैंने अपोजीशन को हमारे एक मेम्बर जो हमारे साथ ज्वाइंट पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी में थे उन्होंने एक एलीगेशन लगाया है कि आंख मूंदकर, ब्लाइंडली, मदद की है सरकार की कमेटी ने । मैं समझता हूं कि उन्होंने कोई कसर नहीं छोड़ी । जो उन्होंने वहां कहा, उसको उन्होंने आज यहां दोहराया है । अगर उनको कोई अलहिदा बात कहनी होती तो उसको कहते । लेकिन मैं इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूं । मैं समझता हूं कि आंख मूंदकर, ब्लाइंडली, जो खबर बाहर से आती थी उसी को वे अपने ढंग से पेश करते थे । मैं एक बात कह दूं जिससे आप को इस बात का पता चल जायेगा । वे वहां कहते थे कि इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के एडीटर को जरूर बुलाया जाये । क्या मतलब था इसका ? मतलब यही

था कि जो वे कहते थे उसकी रिपोर्ट उनको कहां से मिलती थी यह इससे साफ पता लगता है। मुझे अब इस बारे में ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कहना है। लेकिन मैं दो-तीन बातें जरूर अर्ज करना चाहता हूं। बोफोर्स से मैंने खुद क्वेश्चन किया है :

whether Prime Minister and his family are involved in these kick-hacks or, what is called, commission. The reply was in two words: "Absolutely not".

यह उनका कहना है यह मैं समझता हूं। उन्होंने क्या कहा हमें इससे क्या। हम तो यह कहते हैं कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जो बयान दिया है, आज उसको तोड़-मरोड़कर, उसको ध्वस्त करके इस तरह से पेश किया जा रहा है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने इस हाउस में, उस हाउस में, बाहर, हर जगह यह कहा बार-बार यह कहा कि हमारा इस में इन्वाल्वमेंट नहीं है। लेकिन आप इस पर विश्वास नहीं करते। आप विश्वास उन लोगों पर करते हैं जो किसी न किसी ढंग से अखबार वालों को फैब्रिकेटड चीजें देते हैं और वही यहां आकर कहते हैं। फैब्रिकेटड इसलिये मैं कहता हूं कि अगर वी०पी० सिंह यह कहता है कि यह ठीक है तो उस के बारे में जो कहा गया है, साठे जी ने जो कहा है, तो वह सही है या गलत उसका जवाब क्यों नहीं दिया ? जब उससे पूछा गया और कहा गया कि आप इसकी आथेंटिसिटी को साबित करें, इसको प्रव करें तो व वहां से निकल गये। ..(**व्यवधान**)...आप चुप रहिये मैं आपसे बोलता नहीं। मैं चेयर को एड्रेस कर रहा हूं। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं और मैं उसके खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता। लेकिन मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि आपको उसके कंडक्ट की नाप तोल करनी पड़ेगी। वह यू० पी० में चीफ मिनिस्टर थे। वहां क्या कुछ किया, वहां से कैसे छोड़कर आये और यहां चले आये। यहां आकर उन्होंने जो काम किया मुझे उसका पता है। उनके दस्तखत मौजूद है। बोफोर्स को जो पैसा दिया गया, उन्हें सब कुछ पता था और बतौर फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर उनके उस पर दस्तखत किये हुए है। मैं इसमें आगे नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन मैं कहता हूं और अपोजीशन के लिये कहना चाहता हूं ताकि उनको रिमांड हो जाय। उन्होंने कहा था कि हमारे लीडर राजीव गांधी है। इसके साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि मैंने कांग्रेस नहीं छोड़ी, मेरा झंडा तिरंगा झंडा है और उसके साथ लिपटकर मैं मरूंगा। मुझे नहीं पता कुछ दिनों के बाद कैसे ख्याल आया। अगर यह ख्याल-ख्यालात नहीं है, अगर यह बात सही नहीं है तो वह यह क्यों कहते रहे ? उन्होंने यू० पी० में क्या किया, कहां गये, कहां से आये—वह यह साबित करता है कि वे कभी अपनी एक बात पर डटे रहकर कोई बात नहीं कहते। हमेशा गलत बयानी करते है और कनफ्यूजन मे रहकर अपना सारा जीवन व्यतीत करने का फैसला कर चुके है। आप उन को लीडर मानते हैं, मुझे इस में कोई एतराज नहीं है। आप मानें, लेकिन आधी पार्टी इधर है आधी पार्टी उधर है। "इक दिल के टुकड़े हजार हुये, कोई यहां गिरा कोई वहां गिरा।" आप अंदाज लगाइये कि यह जो पार्टियां है तो अब उनका कनफ्यूज्ड लीडर है तो क्या हालत होगी इल्जाम लगाना आसान है, लेकिन उस को साबित करना मुश्किल है, इसलिये आप उसको कहें कि इल्जाम को साबित करें। प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है कि सी० बी० आई० इंक्वायरी कर रही है। उसके नतीजें देखें कि क्या निकलते हैं। उसके बाद प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने यह भी कहा है कि हमने स्विटजरलैंड के साथ संधि करने के लिये कदम उठाये हैं। उसके लिये भी जो "संडे" जिसमें से आपने पढ़कर सुनाया है, उसी में लिखा हुआ है। उन्होंने कहा है दो, चार, पांच महीने निकले है, अब कुछ देर लगती है कोई प्रोसेस होता है उस प्रोसेस से सारी बातें निकलेगी, तो इस में प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कौन सी गलत बात कही है? वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं यह अर्ज करता हूं, मैं एक ही बात कहता हूं कि पिछले दिनों इस दिल्ली के मकाम पर दो दिन

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

एक इजलास हुआ जिस में हमने लोगों की बेहतरी के लिये जो लोग पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे हैं उनके लिये आर्थिक व्यवस्था के ढांचे के बदलने के लिये खराबियों को दूर करने के लिये, उनको रोटी, कपड़ा मकान, तालीम और इलाज की सहूलियतें देने के लिये जिसको सोशलिज्म कहते है उसको लाने के लिये हमने एक सवाल ही नहीं उठाया बल्कि उसको प्रैक्टीकल शेप देने के लिये हमने बात कही है। दो दिनों में यहां जो कुछ हुआ उससे यह बौखला उठे हैं। क्योंकि इनको तो पता ही नहीं है कि उनके क्या प्रोग्राम है।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) पीठासीन हुये]

वह कहते है 70-71 प्रोग्राम बनाये हुये हैं हम यह करेंगे, वह करेंगे। क्या करेंगे उनको पता भी नहीं है। अगर उन में से एक आदमी यहां जो बैठे हैं या जो उनके साथ हैं वह 71 का नाम ही बता दें कि वह कौन सी चीज करना चाहते हैं, खाक करना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान को मिटाना चाहते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की दुर्गति करना चाहते हैं। इलाहाबाद की यहां पर किसी ने बात छेड़ दी मैं नहीं छेड़ना चाहता था कि उस में कौन-कौन से सहायक गये, हमारे खिलाफ यह कहा गया कि एक आदमी जिसने रामायण में प्ले किया था उसके खिलाफ कहा गया। हम यह पूछते है कि वहां हाजी मस्तान किस की हिमायत में गया, वहां सब से बड़ा फिरकेदार कम्यूनल आदमी बुखारी किस के हक में गया और फिर राज बब्बर गया, यह क्या है, क्या कोई खिलौना है जितने आदमी गये किसी ने यह बात कही, कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी जो अपने आप को प्रोग्रेसिव कहते है क्या उन्होंने भी यह कहा कि यह आदमी गलत आये हैं हम आपका साथ देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है। बहुत सी जगहों से कूड़ा इकट्ठा कर के हम पर आप अटैक करते हैं मुझे यह समझ नहीं आया। इलाहाबाद में आपने क्या किया है। ठीक है, हमारी गलतियां हुई तो हम दुरुस्त करेंगे। हम यह नहीं यकीन कर सकते कि आप किसी परपज के लिए काम नहीं कर रहे है। अपोजीशन का परपज यह है अगर किसी एक ही आदमी पर बार बार अटैक किया जाय तो उसका असर जरूर पड़ेगा और वह है प्राइम-मिनिस्टर अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर अटैक होता है तो यह जायेगा और सारा मुल्क जायेगा क्यों कि आपके पास तो लीडर है ही नहीं। अगर लीडर आपके पास होता तो ऐसा होता जिसमें जान हो, जिसमें समाजी ताकत हो जिसमें फैसला लेने की जुर्रत हो जिसमें आगे बढ़ने की ताकत हो। वह तो किसी में है ही नहीं। अगर वह किसी में है तो आज कहता हूं और कल भी कहूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान में दूसरा शख्स ऐसा नहीं है, जो हिन्दुस्तान को इकट्ठा कर के आगे चला सके सिवाय एक इन्सान के जो राजीव गांधी है। अब आप उसको छोटा कहें, बचपन कहे, इम्मच्योर कहें, इस दुनियां में उन्होंने तीसरी ताकत खड़ी कर के बता दिया है कि हिन्दुस्तान तीसरी ताकत है। यह उसने बताया है, उसने किया है, आपने तो नहीं किया है। उसने हर जगह पर जाकर, हर आदमी से, हर मुल्क से बात कर के अपनी ताकत को बनाया है और महात्मा गांधी के पैरोकार बने हैं और कहा है कि दुनियां की तबाही को रोकने के लिये सिर्फ एक ही तरीका है वह नान वायलेंस से हम काम ले सकते हैं। एक तरफ दुनियां की ताकत उन्होंने बनाई है दूसरी तरफ यहां के आर्थिक ढांचे को दुरस्त करने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान के हालात को बदलने के लिये और फिरकापरस्ती का मुकाबला करने के लिये काम किया है। इससे हिन्दुस्तान को तोड़ने वाले जो तत्व हैं उनके दिमाग में एक हलचल पैदा हुई है और दिमाग की कैफियत इस बात में आई है कि बार-बार आप अटेक कर रहे हैं। मैं तो यह कहता हूं कि जब उन्होंने कहा है कि हम देख रहे है उनके साथ बात करेंगे जो कुछ भी निकलेगा हम देंगे तो इसमें क्या गलत बात उन्होंने

कह दी है । यह कहते हैं 99921—पी.यू. टी.यू., पता नहीं क्या क्या कहते हैं, पता नहीं कहां से आया है, यह बतायें और वह इसको साबित करें जो यह कहते हैं लेकिन आज पार्लियामेंट में उस हाऊस में कुछ नहीं कह सके और दूसरा मुंह लेकर चले गये ; मैं बहुत नहीं कहना चाहता, बहुत जानता हूं लेकिन वाइस चेयरमैन साहब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो रिपोर्ट हमने दी थी जिसके चेयरमैन हमारे शंकरानन्द जी थे । वह किसी सरकार के पक्ष में नहीं दी । जो फैक्ट्स हमारे पास आये जो आपोजीशन ने हमारे आनरेबल मेम्बर के हाथ दिये, जो कुछ भी वे दे सकते थे वह सब कुछ दिया और इन सबको सामने रखकर ही हमने फैसला किया, बेशक 64 करोड़ का हो या किसी और चीज का हो । हमने सारे फैक्ट्स रखे है । यह भी है कि जो ठीक बात थी वह हमने रखी । अगर जनरल्स ने कहा कि बहुत अच्छी गन है तो हमने वह जिक्र भी किया, अगर किसी ने कहा यह बात होनी चाहिये तो हमने वह भी जिक्र किया । सब कुछ किया । अब ट्विस्ट करके किसी चीज को लेना, अखबारों से खबरें लेना क्या यह ठीक है । आपको प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर यकीन नहीं है । आपको अपने पर यकीन नहीं है और जो आदमी दूसरे पर यकीन नहीं करता वह समझता है कि वह खुद मशकूक है, इसलिये मशकूक होकर आप हमसे बात मत करें । लोग कहते है बाहर क्या कहते है । उन्होंने कहा कि ये सांसद है, ये पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं जो सारा दिन "बोफोर्स", "बोफोर्स" कहते हैं, सपने में भी, बाहर भी, खाने में भी, पहनने में भी, यहां आकर, वहां जाकर, हर जगह यही कहते हैं "बोफोर्स", "बोफोर्स" । यह कोई पूजा पाठ की बात क्या आप कर रहे हैं, यह मुझे बताइये । कोई और प्रोग्राम नहीं है आपके पास सिवाय इस बोफोर्स के प्रोग्राम के ? दूसरा प्रोग्राम चाहे हिन्दुस्तान की शक्ति बनाने का हो.. (व्यवधान) इनके हाथ बन्द नहीं करते तो जबान तो बन्द कीजिये ।

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** एक ही आपके लिये काफी है ।

**श्री दरबारा सिंह :** रिस्पांसिबिलिटी से काम लीजिये । मैं फिर कहता हूं कि आपोजीशन का काम आपोजीशन करना होता है लेकिन कन्स्ट्रक्टिव, डिस्ट्रक्टिव नहीं । हिन्दुस्तान की आज की हालत जो है उसमें से हम क्या बढ़ चढ़कर कर सकते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के लिये, गरीबों के लिये और इनको आगे मजबूत बनाने के लिये ताकि दुनिया में इसकी ताकत बने और हिन्दुस्तान इनके लिये मजबूत बन सके क्या इसके लिये आपका कोई प्रोग्राम है । एक ही प्रोग्राम रखे हुये हैं कि "ही मस्ट गो, प्राइम मिनिस्टर मस्ट गो, ही शुड रिजाइन, आप तो मेरे ख्याल में श्मशान भूमि के मारे है और कुछ नहीं लगता है । आप सिर्फ यही चाहते हैं कि यहां श्मशान भूमि बन जाय और लोग लड़ लड़कर मर जायें । आज इस हद तक जो कुछ हो रहा है मुझे ऐसा लगता है कहीं आप इनकी मदद तो नहीं कर रहे है, ऐसे अल्फाज कहकर कि इनको ऐसा डिसक्रेडिट किया जाये । वे लगे हुये हैं सरहद पर आप लगे हुये हैं हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर । आप हिन्दुस्तान के इस लीडर को खत्म करना चाहते है, वे खत्म करना चाहते हैं हिन्दुस्तान को, आया कहीं इस बात के लिए मिलीभगत तो नहीं हो गयी है । मैं कहता हूं कि आप अपने अंदर झाककर देखिए कि आप क्या कर रहे है ... (व्यवधान) इनकी जुबान पर कुछ तो काबू होना चाहिए । आप नही कर सकते कुछ तो अपना चेरा बाहर जाकर पानी वगैरह पीकर आ जायें ताकि मैं इस समय खत्म कर लू । मैं सिर्फ आखिर मे यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि मुल्क चाहता है कि मुल्क की तरक्की हो, मुल्क चाहता है कि यहां स्टेबिलिटी हो, लोग चाहते हैं कि लोगों को रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान, तालीम और अनाज ये पांच चीजे मिलें । इसके लिए आप हमारे साथ हों । मैं समझता हूं कि यह ठीक है । आप कभी किसी भी बात को उठाते हैं कभी दूसरी को आपको

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

कहां आओ पंजाब पर बात करें तो आप छुप रहे हैं । आप कहते हैं कि ये लीडर हैं फलां लीडर है । आपका कोई लीडर नहीं है । ठीक कहा आज प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कि इनका कोई लीडर ही नहीं है, किससे बात करें । कोई आता नहीं कोई जाता नहीं सब अपने अपने लीडर है, आधे यहां बैठे हैं आधे लीडर बाहर बैठे हैं, अपनी चालें निकालते हैं आधे सुनते हैं । आपकी क्या रूपरेखा बन गयी है। आप अपना घर सुधारिए हम तो यह कहना चाहते हैं । हम आपकी मदद करना चाहते हैं आपसे सिम्पैथाइज होना चाहते हैं । इसलिए आप इस बात पर आइये और जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बयान पार्लियामेंट में दिया है वह उस पर स्टैंड करते हैं और न उन्होंने कोई पैसा लिया न उनकी फेमिली ने लिया न किसी हिंदुस्तानी ने लिया है जिसने लिया उसकी इन्क्वायरी सी.बी.आई. कर रही है । इन्हीं अल्फाज के साथ आपका शुक्रिया ।

**श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, झूठ के निरंतर अनर्गल प्रलाप से विपक्ष झूठ को सच और सच को झूठ करने की एक विफल चेष्टा कर रहा है । मैंने भारतीय इतिहास के पन्ने उठाकर देखे हैं । राजनीति में मुझे यह महसूस होता है कि हिंदुस्तान का विपक्ष आज जिस मात्रा में हताश है शायद ऐसा हताश वह पहले के किसी भी समय में नहीं रहा है और अपनी हताशा को यह चेष्टा में परिणित कर रहा है—नीतिविहीन दिशा-विहीन कार्यक्रम-विहीन और यह कहिये कि बुद्धि-विहीन कार्यक्रमों पर अपना पूरा जोर लगा करके देश में लोकतांत्रिक ढांचे को विफल करने का प्रयास जो कर रहे हैं इससे देश की जनता आपको कभी माफ नहीं कर सकती ।

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** आप तथ्यों के आधार पर देखिये ।... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग :** तथ्यों के आधार पर देखिये सरकार की चेष्टा पर देखिये और सरकार के कार्यक्रम पर देखिये कि वह देश के जन-जन के कल्याण के लिए क्या करने जा रही है ।

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** भ्रष्ट सरकार कुछ नहीं कर सकती ।

**श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग :** आपके मानस में भ्रष्टता है आपकी नीति में भ्रष्टता है, आपके दिलों में भ्रष्टता है कि और इसी कारण वह सत्य को सत्य के स्वरूप में नहीं देख सकते है और इसी वजह से आज का जो विपक्ष है वह यह नहीं देख रहा है कि देश का कल्याण किन कार्यक्रमों में है देश को कौन सही दिशा दे रहा है और किस दिशा में हम जा रहे हैं । मिश्र जी चले गये है बैठते तो मैं उनको बताता कि यह बात नहीं है ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह:** चालीस साल का इतिहास बतायेगा सही दिशा ।... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग :** मिश्र जी चले गये है, बैठते तो मैं उनको बताता कि यह बात नहीं है कि राजीव गांधी का नाम लेकर के उनकी सरकार के कार्यक्रमों का नाम लेकर जो बात आप कहने जा रहे है मैं पूछता हूं आज आप कह रहे है कि पं. नेहरू के जमाने में ऐसी कोई बात नहीं थी इंदिरा गांधी के जमाने मे कोई ऐसी बात नहीं थी, इतना आज उत्कृष्टताओं के नीचे जा रहे हैं, मैं उन्हीं से पूछना चाहता हूं--मिश्र जी है नहीं---उन्हीं की पार्टी के लोगों ने यह कहा था जब पं० नेहरू ने भाखड़ा नांगल बांध कार्यक्रम की बात की जब उन्होंने सिंचाई की बात की तब आपकी ही पार्टी थी जिन्होंने यह कहा था कि ---

Nehru: is suffering from gigantism-

वह यही लोग थे और आज कह रहे हैं कि नेहरू की नीतियां सर्वश्रेष्ट थी, उत्कृष्ट थी---और वह भी तब जब वह नहीं रहे ।

इंदिरा गांधी के जमाने में आपने इंदिरा गांधी को क्रिटिसाईज किया । यहां तक कि सरकार के कार्यक्रमों को लेकर

ऐसी चेष्टायें की गई । श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी हिंदुस्तान के इतिहास को काल संदूक में दबाकर आने वाली पीढ़ियों को बताना चाहती थी हिंदुस्तान का भूतकाल क्या था । इन्होंने खोल लिया उसको और देखा कि उसमें से कुछ नहीं निकला । जो कार्यक्रम इंदिरा गांधी ने किये, यही सदन उसकी गवाही और साक्षी देता है ।

देश के जन-जन के कल्याण के लिए बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण के कार्यक्रम का जब यहां पर प्रस्ताव लाया गया, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं राम अवधेश सिंह जी से कि आपका साथ देने वाले कौन से पक्ष के लोग थे ? देश के इतिहास को विफल करने में कौन से लोगों ने साथ दिया ? यह वही लोग थे ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** आपको मालूम भी है कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री मोर्जा इर्शादबेग :** यह वही लोग जो इन कार्यक्रमों को मानते नहीं थ... **(व्यवधान)** और आज भी कह रहे हैं कि इंदिरा गांधी के कार्यक्रम उत्कृष्ट थे । ... **(व्यवधान)** जब आप सत्ता में थे... **(व्यवधान)** आप बैठिये ... **(व्यवधान)** सच्चाई को सुनिये यह कटु सत्य है, इसको सुनिये और बर्दाश्त कीजिए ।... **(व्यवधान)**

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :** आपको समय मिला था, आपने अपनी बात कह दी है । अब आप उनकी बात सुनिये ।

**श्री मोर्जा इर्शादबेग :** मैं बोफर्स पर भी कह सकता हूं... **(व्यवधान)** बोफर्स समिति के एक सदस्य के नाते से एक-एक डाकूमेंट को मैंने अपने चक्षुओं से देखा है । आप भी सरकार में आए थे । बताइये मुझे बिचौलिये दूर करने की बात आपने कहीं थी, जनता सरकार ने कही थी । कहां है आपका वह मानस, कहां है आपका वह स्टेटस, कहां है आपकी वह भावना ?

यह मेरा लीडर था, राजीव गांधी था जिसने इस देश के लोगों को कहा कि ऐसे सौदों में कोई बिचौलिये नहीं रहे।

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** आप सच्चाई को बताइये ।

**श्री मोर्जा इर्शादबेग :** बता रहे है, लेकिन सच्चाई को आखें मूद कर आप देख रहे हैं, आपने आंखें मूंद ली है । आप देखना नहीं चाहते कि आपके सामने सत्य क्या है ।

मान्यवर, सूरज के सामने आखें मूंद लेने से सूरज की रोशनी पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ता ।

समिति बनाने के लिए किसने कहा था ? क्यों नहीं आए हमारे साथ समिति में–देख लेते एक-एक डाकूमेंट और अगर आते तो देखते कि विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह ने एज ए फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने भी इस पर दस्तखत किये थे ।

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** आपको टर्म्स पर नहीं आए है ।

**श्री मोर्जा इर्शादबेग :** हमारी टर्म्स क्या थीं ? वह यह थीं कि सच्चाई देखनी है । ... **(व्यवधान)** क्योंकि यह सब बातें राजनीति से प्रेरित थी । ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** हम चाहते हैं कि सच्चाई को बताया जाए ।... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री मोर्जा इर्शादबेग :** जब यह वोट लेने, लोगों का विश्वास लेने के लिए गये हैं, तो आपको देश की जनता ने इतना धक्का दिया है और इसके लिए आप हताश हो गये । आप हताश हो गए है और समस्त विपक्ष आज हताश है और वह देखना चाहता है राजीव गांधी की सरकार को जो एक स्थापित सरकार है उसको कैसे उलट किया जा सके । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप क्यों नहीं आते और देखते कि डाकूमेंट क्या है ? सरकार ने जो बात

[श्री मिर्जा इर्शाद बेग]

स्वीडन के साथ की है, सरकार ने जो बात बोफोर्स के साथ में की है ? एक-एक पत्र आपको दी है और एक-एक सच्चाई आपके सामने रखी है । लेकिन आज ही लोक दल, यह आपका लोकदल, परलोक दल और फिर क्या मालूम है वह जनता दल दलदल बना गया है और दलदल के नेता के बारे में बहुत बातें हुई हैं । आइये, सच्चाई साबित कीजिए । हमारे नेताओं ने भी कहा है कि एक एकाऊंट का नम्बर दिया है कि आइये साबित कर दीजिए । भ्रष्टाचार के लिए तो हम नहीं कह रहे हैं यहीं आपके पड़ोस में अलग-बगल में बैठने वाले उनके जो नेता हैं, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि उनके खिलाफ कोर्ट ने स्ट्रिकचर्ज पास नहीं किए ? दाग तो बहुत दामन पर लगे हैं । लेकिन राजीव गांधी के खिलाफ तो किसी कोर्ट ने स्ट्रिक्चर पास नहीं किया । मान्यवर, विभ्रम तो बहुत प्रयास थे कि इंदिरा गांधी को भी देश से उखाड़ कर फैंक दें, लोगों के मानस से उखाड़ कर फैंक दें । गांव पंच आपने बनाए हैं । गांव पंच ने जमीन उलट दी है ; मान्यवर, बाल-बाल उलटा है, यहां तक कि महरौली के इंदिरा गांधी के घर को भी नहीं छोड़ा । लेकिन निकला क्या ? जब ये सब बातें निकलीं तो देश के मानस ने देखा, जन जन ने देखा कि ये सब बातें निकालने से यह बात साबित हो करके आई देश के लोगों के सामने कि इंदिरा गांधी एक ऐसी सच्चाई है, एक ऐसी हकीकत है कि जिसको कभी भुलाया नहीं जा सकता । लोगों ने देखा और लोगों ने इतिहास को पलटा और आपको यहां पांच साल के लिए लाया गया था और आपको अपने आप ही उसने हटाया तथा इंदिरा गांधी को प्रस्थापित किया । आप बोफोर्स गन की बात कर रहे हैं, उसके डील की बात कर रहे हैं । सब सच्चाई आपके सामने रखी गई और अभी भी सरकार का यह प्रयास है, सरकार अभी भी इन्क्वायरी कर रही है । गलत और झूठी बयानबाजी पर आज आपका विपक्ष इन नेताओं को ले करके चल रहा है । मैं आपसे पूछता हूं, राम अवधेश जी, इतना देश में अकाल था, आपकी प्रायरिटीज क्या हैं ? यह तो मेरी पार्टी थी, राजीव गांधी का नेतृत्व था कि देश में जहां-जहां अकाल पड़ा वहां-वहां कांग्रेस इकाइयों ने जा करके लोगों के बीच में काम किया है । मान्यवर, जनता पार्टी कहां गई, लोक दल कहां गया, भारतीय जनसंघ कहां गया और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी कितने लोगों के पास पहुंची ? कहां है आपकी नीति ? अरे, कोई जगह नहीं पहुंची । यह झूठ है ।

. . . . . .

मान्यवर, बचपन में एक कहानी पढ़ा करता था जिसका नाम "अलीबाबा और चालीस चोर" था । न जाने कौन सी जमात यह अलीबाबा कौन हैं और 40 चोर कहां बैठे हैं ? लोग देख रहे हैं और लोगों को मालूम है । आप जाकर देखिए, उत्तर प्रदेश के जो निर्णय आए हैं उसके अनुसार 80 प्रतिशत जनता ने कांग्रेस के शासन में अपना विश्वास प्रस्थापित किया है । आपको मालूम न हो तो देख लीजिए, आज भी नतीजे आ रहे हैं और वह भी 80 प्रतिशत हमारी फेवर में आ रहे हैं । लोग जानते हैं कि यह आपकी मिली-भगत है देश के उन एजेंटों के साथ में और आपने जिसको नेता प्रस्थापित किया है विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह, फेयरफेक्स के० सी० आई०ए० वालों के साथ में बैठ करके देश की जो खुफिया बातें पहुंचाई आपने देश के उन गद्दारों के साथ में वह देश को मालूम है और देश पहचानता है । देश की जनता का वह मानस है उसका एक हृदय है, उसकी एकदृष्टि है और वह पहचानने की क्षमता रखती है । जब समय आयेगा तब पता लग जायेगा कि देश की जनता राजीव गांधी के नेतत्व के साथ है या अंधेरे में भटकने वाले विपक्ष के साथ में है । मैं आपको पूछना चाहता हूं कि आपकी नीतियां कहां हैं ? आप बोलते क्यों नहीं हैं ? देश में बहुत से इश्यू हैं । देश में कम्युनल वातावरण का जहर फैलता जा रहा है आपके बगल में बैठने वाले कुछ लोगों के कारण, उनकी नीतियों के कारण और उनके मानस के कारण, उसे रोकने की आपके पास क्या चेष्टा है ? राम-जन्म-भूमि और बाबरी मस्जिद का इश्यू है । क्या आपकी नीति है और आपके क्या आर्थिक कार्यक्रम हैं ? अरे, यह तो राजीव गांधी का

एक मानस और नेतृत्व देश में काम कर रहा है जो आज कहना चाहता है कि देश में से कम्युनल वातावरण को दूर किया जाए। यही करना चाहता है। अभी नहीं समझोगे और अभी नहीं समझोगे तो इकबाल ने कहा था कि :—

"मिट जाओगे जो अभी भी नहीं समझोगे तो मिट जाओगे, और तुम्हारा नाम भी नहीं होगा दास्तानों में।"

मान्यवर, अब इनको समझ ही नहीं है तो मैं क्या बोलूं। इनके पास न वह दृष्टि है, न वह मानस है, न वह दिमाग रखते हैं और खाली दिमाग से बोफोर्स-बोफोर्स लेकर जाते है ... (व्यवधान)...

Yes, 1 am reply to you. What ever the speeches made by the Opposition people, I am replying to the same. My Minister will reply to all the things. (Intemiptions). Listern, time will come when the people of India will decide the further of the country. What do you say?

मान्यवर, मुझे फिर एक श्लोक याद आ रहा है, "सुभाषित" में कहा गया है—

"काक कृष्णा, पिका कृष्णा, को भेद पिक काकयो अरे वसंत प्रातःकाले काके काकः पिका पिकः।"

मान्यवर, यह देश की जनता को पता है कि कौवा कौन है और कोयल कौन है। वसंत ऋतु जब आएगी तब पता लगेगा, उसकी आवाज से कि यह कौवा है और यह कोयल है। आपको फिक्र करने की जरूरत नहीं है देश की जनता ने जब-जब चाहा, तब प्रस्थापित किया पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू को, तब प्रस्थापित किया लाल बहादुर शास्त्री को, तब प्रस्थापित किया इंदिरा गांधी को और ऐसा समय भी आया कि जब जनता ने समझा इंदिरा गांधी जी अभी लायक नहीं हैं तो घर पर भी बैठाया और उसी जनता ने भारी बहुमत के साथ देश में इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व को, कांग्रेस से नेतृत्व को फिर से यहां पर प्रस्थापित किया।

बोफोर्स की चर्चा के दौरान मान्यवर उपसभापति जी, मैंने कहा था कि यह मसला राजनीति से प्रेरित होकर के चला रहे हैं और इसको इलेक्शन तक चलाते रहेंगे। ऐसा विपक्ष के लोगों ने अभी कमिटमेंट भी किया है। तो यह राजनीति से प्रेरित बातें हैं। गन या बोफोर्स उनके लिये कुछ नहीं लगती। यह तो राजीव गांधी की सक्षमता है कि कांग्रेस की एक विचारधारा है, जिसकी वजह से हमारे सामने सबसे बड़ी प्रायरिटी देश की सुरक्षा है, देश की सीमाओं की सुरक्षा है, देश के लोगों के नागरिक हकों की स्वतंत्रता और उसकी सुरक्षा है। उस प्रायरिटी को आप नहीं समझोगे। दरबारा सिंह जी ने सही कहा, आप उन शक्तियों के साथ है, यह फेयरफैक्स में सी० बी० आई० इंक्वारी कर रही है, विश्वास नहीं है, सी०आई०ए० में उनका विश्वास है और सी० आई० ए० के लोगों के साथ बैठकर के सब जो हमारी खुफिया फाइल हैं, स्कूप दिया है उन लोगों को, हर्षमेन के साथ बात की है। क्या सी० आई० ए० के इतिहास से आप अनजान हैं? सी० आई० ए० ने समग्र विश्व में क्या किया है, उससे आप अनजान हैं? वही नेता को बैठाते जा रहे हैं। देश की जनता आपको माफ नहीं करेगी और देश की जनता आपको बताकर रख देगी कि देश की जनता का विश्वास कहां है?.... (व्यवधान)

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** प्रधान मंत्री अनजान है। इसके लिये प्रधान मंत्री जवाब दें।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) :** आप बैठ जाइए राम अवधेश जी। जब आप भाषण करते हैं तो पूरी बात कह दिया करें। आप बैठिए दूसरे लोग हैं विपक्ष के वे बोल देंगे।

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह :** प्रधान मंत्री खुद जवाब दें... (व्यवधान).....

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : मान्यवर अंत में मैं यही कहना चाहता हू कि आज देश में को अधिक आवश्यकता है । मान्यवर आपकी तरह मैं भी एक-दो देश में जाकर आया हू । वहां मैंने देखा है कि मेरे प्रधान मंत्री जी और मेरी पार्टी के नेता ने किस ढंग से देश के एक लेवल को ऊंचा लाकर विश्व स्तर पर इसको इज्जत दिलाई है, किस तरह आबरू दिलाई है । इस आबरू की दहशत में आ कर आज यही लोग पागल बनकर अंधाधुंध जो यह इस तरह की बाते कर रहे हैं उसमे उनका कोई भी लक्ष्य हो, उस लक्ष्य को यह पा नहीं सकेंगे । देश की जनता जानती है कि उनके सही काम कौन कर रहा है, देश की महिलाएं जानती हैं देश के युवक जानते है, देश का विद्यार्थी जगत जानता है कि उनका श्रेय कहां है, देश का श्रेय कहां है, देश का हित कहां है और देश के असीम हित में आने वाले दिनों में उनका निर्णय करने वाला है । आने वाले दिनों में वे आपको बताएंगे और उस वक्त राम अवधेश जी मुझे याद रहेगा आप माथा पकड़ कर कोने में बैठकर रोएं ।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात खतम करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir I straightway would like to s'.i ike at the very foundation of the cover-up edifice built up by this Govem-ment on Bofors. A mass of evidence contained in three types of transaction document, obtained by The 'Hindu' from highly authoritative sources established that commission payments by Bofors to the three recipient fronts, Sevenska Incorporated. Pitco-Moresco-Moineao and A. E. Services Limited. are firmly linked to the payments made by thc Government of india to Bofors in 1986-87 against invoiced deliveries or as advances. Among thc vai ions documents published in 'The Hindu', there is a remittance document relating to the code name 'Tulip. The type of payment is coded 62, the banking code for commissions. The instruction at thc bottom translates fts 'Attention'. The sender should not be mentioned or the payment as per instructions given on telephone . Sir, on 3rd August this year, when we discussed Bofors 1 made specific questions to the Government and 1 quote:

> '"Will this Government request the Swedish Prosecutor to make a fresh investigation based upon the published relevant materials in 'The Hindu', have a fresh probe?"

That was my question. Again, I put another question:

> May I ask this Government to investigate Account No. 99921 TU of Svenska Incorporated in the Societe de Banque Suisse located at No. 2 Rue de La Confederation, CH—1211 Geneva? It is a specific demand. I will also refer to payments made to 'Lotus'. These were made into Societe de Banque. Suisse. 2 Rue de La Confederation, and a payment was made also on 22nd December 1986...'

Sir, I placed these specific questions before the Government in the month of August in this forum. Mr. K. C. Pant nas kind enough to reply. f quote his reply,

> "Wc wil] <jo what is normally done. So far as Mr. Gopalsamy's question is concerned, we are relying on our own agencies and we have confidence in them."

Now, Sir I would like to know from this Government: What information have you elicited through your ageneies? This ig the question. Now some account number has been given by Mr. V. P. Singh and discussion is going on. When f put the question before the Government in the month of August, Mr. Pant was kind enough to say that he w"is relying upon our own agencies. Again, our hon. Prime Minister in his interview to the Sunday' magazine said:

> We have not finished trying CBI is looking into it."

Mr. Gandhi went on to tell the interviewers that Mohan Katre, the Director

of CBl, had gone and met Mr. Lars Ringberg as well as persons in Sweden's National Bank. Explaining rh$_e$ reasons why th$_e$ Governrrient had not acted on The Hindu' documents Mr. Gandhi said, among other things, that 'The Hindu' documents were said by tb$_e$ Swedish bank to have some defects in them. He was asked what those defects were and he said. 'Theie aie some doubts about their authenticity. Sir. Mr. Per Wendel fiom Stockholm made a write-up yesterday which has appeared in today's Indian Express'. I would like $^{t0}$ quote the Chief Lawyer of th$_e$ Swedish National Bank Mr. Aake Gustafsson. Tn the report it is stated;

> The Chief lawyer of the Swedishi National Bank. Mr. Aak$_e$ Gustafsson, today confirmed to m$_e$ that two officers from india bad visited the bank. But his account of the meeting is the opposite of the one conveyed by Mr. Gandhi, "W$_e$ told them a$_s$ we always do Mr. Gustafsson says, "that" they had made th$_e$ trip in vain."

[The Vice-Chirman (Shri Jagesh Desal): in the Chair]

Mr. Gustafsson states categorically that "we did not make any comment on the authenticity of these documents". This goes contrary to what was asserted by our honourable Prime Minister about the authenticity of t'ne documents published in THE HINDU. So it is a total denial about the statement of the honourabe Prime Minister...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI); That is what THE INDIAN EXPRESS says.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY. Yes; this is a report from Per Wendel from Stockholm about Ringberg because our honourable Prime Minister made a reference to Ringberg. Mr. Ringberg confirms. "These gentlemen had no accreditation with themselves." He is referring to these officers from the CBI. "There $^{was}$ no diplomatic contact before th$_e$ visit and they had not been in contact with in-terpol Because of this it was not possible for th$_e$ Swedish National Police to meet *ibcie* gentlemen." Therefore, T would like to know from the Government whether there was any diplomatic con tact, whether the Government of India took steps with the Interpol. These are the very agitating questions "Mr. Ringberg also goes on to say that he told the Indian visitors that several •nonths ago he had asked the Indian au thorities if any kind of investigation was going on in Indian on these matters. He says lhat h$_e$ told the visitors that the questions 'have been repeated $^{a}$jot of times' but irt spite of this having been done, he had not received any answer as yet." l would like to know from the Government whether Mr. Ringberg is cor rect as per the version of Mr. Per Wendel, whether h$_e$ made any requests •o this Government, if so, what the reaction has been of this Government to those requests. Om* honourable Prim$_s$ Minister said in Bangalore on 10th November before the press when he was asked a specific question "Whether or not the documents revealed th$_e$ payment of commission". "Mr, Gandhi said, 'We hav$_e$ never denied it' adding 'th$_e$ CBI is looking into it' "- When th$_e$ Prime Minister made the statement before the press that we hav$_e$ never denied about the commission money th$_e$ Government officials—they were $^{verv}$ intelligent and they were very alert—cam$_e$ with a denial; a denial came from the spokesmen of the Government. They gave a new interpretation to the statement of the Prime Minister as if he had not denied about the publication of THE HINDU reports—a new interpretation. How many somersaults will the Government make? First when the Swedish Broadcasting Radio made th$_e$ revelation, when theie was a bolt from the blue from the Swedish Broadcasting Radio, our honourable Prim$_0$ Minister said, "No question of commission money". 'There had been no middlemen". So the payment of commission money was totally denied by him. lt was supported by Mr. Arun Singh on the floor of this very House im ihe month of April last year. Then the very* same Mr. Arun Singh cam$_e$ here again and said, "Bofors had committed a breach of faith, So the monies should *b$_e$* refunded". Our honourable Prime Minister cornes to Parliament and says,

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

"There has been no payment of commission money". Now he takes the P°si~ tion, "Neither I nor the members of my family received any money from Bofors". Sir, I agree fully with him. Our honourable prime Minister is honesty according to his version; I agree. But a million-dollar question is to be answered by this Government. Payment of commission has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt, with irrefutable evidence and with incontrovertible evidence. So, the commission money has been paid, crores of rupees have been paid, to fetch this deal, to get I'nis order, from the Government of India. Then I would like to know for what reasons Bofors paid the commission money to X or Y or Z. Our honourable Prime Minister is honest, according to his version; I agree. But who is that extra-constitutional authority, who is that gentleman, behind the curtain? Who is the man who influenced the Government to finalise the deal? I am asking this because it is our Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, who has finalised the deal since he was handling the portfolio of Defence. So, this is the question which is agitating the mind of everybody. Who is that extra-constitutional authority and who is that big man who could give orders above the head of the Prime Minister? So, there should be a deal. Otherwise Bofors are not fools or idiots *to* part with such a good amount of money in the name of commission payment. So, the commission money has been paid and that has been proved. But for whom? For what reasons? What js his address? Our honourable Prime Minister is honest, according to his version; I agree. Then it is the duty not only of the Government, but also of every citizen of this country to find out the truth. You have to find out who that scoundrel is, who that culprit is, who that offender is, who has looted this money. Who has looted this money? Who is behind the curtain to influence the Government to strike the deal? This is the question.

' Sir,' how many somersaults this Government does!'! am trying to say that "Mr. Clean"—once he was applauded as a clean person, as "Mr. Clean"—has become a man of many somersaults. How many somersaults he does! He says, "No commission money.". Then he says, "Neither I nor the members of my family have received any money.". When the question of Hindujas came up he said... *(Time bell ings). Only* one minute, Sir. When the question of Hindujas came up, he said, "I did not meet anybody fiom Bofors.". But it was above beyond any shadow of doubt that Hindujas met Mr. Martin Arbbo and others, the Bofors peo-ple.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: What does it mean?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; It is the duty of the Government to come and teil the Parliament. The Government is accountable to the country, the Government is accountable to the people. So, they should come and tell Parliament as to who the recipients are, who the recipients of this money are. Therefore, Sir. I say that you are not pursuing your investigation. It is only a cover-up. When you say that the CBI is looking into it, it is only a cover-up. That is why you ar* not sincere in probing it, in finding out the truth. That is why questions arise. Who are the recipients of this money? The credibility of the Government has been totally demolished. The casualty in the whole episode is truth and nothing but truth. The casulty is truth. Because of the versions of the honourable Prime Minister, if somebody wants to find out the meaning of "falsehood" or untruth" in the Chambers Dictionary or Oxford Dictionary or in any other dictionary, we can give a new interpretation because the Government is giving a new interpretation and so. one can give a new interpretation to the utterances of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi during the years 1987 and 1988 in Ws capacity as Prime Minister: His utterances are nothing but falsehoods and untruths and -, the utterances of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi are equivalent to falsehood and untruth. That is why his credibility has been lost and the people are telling... *(Jnterruptiotts)* ...The Government is put in the dock ... *(Time bell* rings)... Only one

minute, Sir. The Government is in the dock. Sir, th© 'Government is put in th.' dock, and this Government, headed by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, will face the trial. Not only that. He will face the 8.00 P.M. punishment also. The real culprits who have been protected by this Government will face the trial and punishment because their days are being numbered; days of sitting in power nave been numbered. The day is not far off to put these people who have looted the people- money in the dock, and they will face the consequences.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. J. S. Aurora. Ten minutes.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I won't take ten minutes. 1 am not going to take too long a time because enough has been said already. All I have to say is that any doubt that might have remained in anyone's mind that middlemen existed and commissions were paid by A. 1$. Bofors to certain people and parties relating to the medium machine-gun contract with the Government of India have now been completely removed. Ampls documentary evidence has been disclosed by the media and others to convince even the Doubting Thomases. And eventually the Prime Minister had to accept that commissions have been paid. But he tried . to create a red herring to explain away the documented revelation, which he can-hot deny. To consider that this money might have been paid for some work that had been done by certain parties for A. B. Bofors to the tune of Rs. 64 crores, I think, is beyond the coprehension of anybody that that much money would have been paid just for the purpose of finding information about the competitive corporations. I do admire however the Prime Minister's fighting a rearguard battle so valiantly. In fact it almost looks like a strip-tease dance, and it seems that very little is left to clothe the excuses that have been produced so far. I also know that he has been very faithfully and diligently served by his Ministers and the Joint Parliamentary Committee members, but not with any degree of success. Why? Because ihey have failed to carry conviction in the puolic mind. Truth must eventually preven!. iNow that the truth is out, a great ettort is being made to malign the erst-wuiie finance Minister and Defence Al inister who was forced to quit becausa ne was a misfit amongst the people who put party before country and self-interesi twiore morality and duty. From the outset, the uovernment reacted to any mention ot wiong doing in this deal most violently. Charges were ievelled against the Opposition for trying to destabilise the country- Spurious letters appeared in papers from the CIA to convince people. The Prink. Minister jumped into the arena stating that he had personally made certain, that there would be no middlemen and hence no commission. Later, when payments could not be hidden these were turned into winding-up charges, still insisting that as there was no middleman and no commission. When Shri Arun Singh as the Defence Minister of State wanted to put the Bofors officials on the mat, summon them to explain why and how certain parties had been paid moneys his decision was countermanded. But later when a strategy was worked out, the same officials wer; called to give evidence, first in front of the Government and then later before ths Joint Parliamentary Committee. And this was accepted as a gospel truth. Later during the discussion when Shri Arun Singh wanted action taken against Bofors, three Ministers got up to defend Bofors. Why? Because the Government was reluctant to look further into the payment Promises were made that the CBI would carry out investigation but nothing has come out of it. Now when the cat is out of the bag the Prime Minister has shifted his ground again. The CBI which is supposed to be looking into the payment^ the CBI officials have gone to meet the officials in Sweden on a private visit without being sposored by the Government diplomatically. The fact is that the Government from the beginning tried to stonewall the payment because it has something to hide. Being in power it can block information. This may prevent complete exposure. But it does not increase the Government's credibility with the public. The Leader of the House, while intervening, asked some questions. **I** would like to

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]

react to them. He asked, "What is the debate for?" My answer is, "Accountability of the Executive to the Legislature which has been denied to *us*$_i$ and honest information to the public and it has also been denied." And that is why the debate is necessary. The second point is: We are creating an issue. We are not creating an issue. It is an issue which will not go away until such time the Government is able td- give convincing and honest answers. Now, it has been $_s$aid that V. P. Singh signed the contract when he was the Minister of Finance. Of course, he did. Bat he signed the contract on terms and conditions which had been accepted first by the Defence Ministry and, I am sure, later on by ffie Cabinet. But he did not sign the contract about approving the pay-menT of commissions. Now, we are even today being asked to accept that there have been no middlemen. I am afraid it is impossible to accept when commissions have been paid and commissions can only be. paid if there were middlemen. So it is no use repeating this statement *ad inifinl-tum* because it is not believable. Issues were also raised about the quality of the gun. We have alway$_s$ accepted that it is a good gun; not necessarily *the* best gun. but it is a good gun, a very good gun. But as I said earlier on during the day, it is comparable with Sofma gun produced by the French. Therefore, now to say. "Having bought a good gun, could anybody have influenced the actual contract? What is wrong -when it is in competition and knowing people are apt to accept kickbacks, that Bofor$_s$ gave larger kickbacks than the French poeple did and therefore they landed the co^tTact?"

I would like to mention that in this case the Prime Minister's own reputation is involved. To clear himself it is vital that the Government comes out with the truth, nothing but the truth, and it is no longer relevant to say that what information had been given to us is not sufficient as an evidence and the Government cannot take any further action. If I may be permitre'd a slight digression we all know who the guilty wer$_e$ of November '84 killings an-J carnage. By not taking action against those people, $^{th}$e public ha$_s$ started sus pecting that. .. .**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): No, no, this kind of remark should not be on record. Th$_e$ Prime Minister himself had gone there that night and you are talking like that *(ln-terruptions)*

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I am finishing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHR! JAGESH DESAI): Thi$_8$ kind of remark should not be recorded. This will not go record.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Why not? Arv: you going to say that the gnilty have been punished?

SHRl CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: The Prime Minister himself took the strongest measures to quel the riot.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: $^{Bu}$t has the guilty been punished?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Punishing is *n* different thing and our uttering that is quite a different thing. That does not form part of the proceedings.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHA-RJEE: What i$_s$ unparliamentary about it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAl): It is irrelevant. It wlil not be on record.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: That is the trouble. This Government is incapable of facing the truth.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I am not in agreement with him on this issue. I$_($ may be unfortunate but there is nothing unparliamentary about it. Why should it b$_e$ off the record? That is not proper, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

*No$_t$ recorded.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Tell me. Sir, is there any justification by this Government that thousands of people are kined and nobody is punished? And you don't want that to go on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): It has no relevance.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA; If you do not take action, if you cannot do justice, your Government has lost all moral risht to govern.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It has no relevance. It will not form part Of the record.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: And because there is a minute minority, you wani to get away with it. You will not. I can assure you that fbis Government will fall because it is being built on false foundations. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: This Government is here not lt your mercy. (*Interrupt ions*).

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): He has said nothing unparliamentary. He has**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have not said that the last part is wrong. I have not allowed only that is no! relevant.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: j What is wrong? Please tell rne. what is unparliamentary there?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have not said unparliamentary. I said that it is irrelevant *(Interruptions)* Now the matter ends there.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: If I may- be permitted to say, this Government is incapable to do justice, to come out honestly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI j JAGESH DESAI): That youi can say. I hawe no objection.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Will you allow that?

"Not recorded.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): That you can say.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA:- AU right, you put that in. It is unable to do justice and, therefore, it has lost all moral right to govern.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAT): Now, Shri Hanumanthappa.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, having heard all the discussion OJJ this, I am surprised that t'ne h°n- Member, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, who raised the discussion is not present here. They said, the ieported disclosures. I do not know when he came to know of these disclosures. According *to* Mr. Gopalsamy, he himself has put all the details on the fl°°r °f the House in t'ne month of August itself. And now in the month of November again they say about 'the reported disclosures' and that they want a discussion. Sir, the point here is that the Opposition is not interested in the truth or in a discussion or in the reply or in the accountability. If that was their attitude, they would have sat through to listen to the replies because every Member from this side giving some sort of reply to their points

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Poutical replies.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Yes, you are also playing politics. What for you are a political party? You are also playing politics. I am also play ing politics. Let us accept it. Why are you shouting every time about Shri Lanka? It is because of politics. *(In terruptions)* When Mr. Gopalsamy In terrupts, I have to answer. I have to pay him in the same coin.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: But all your speakers did not meet the point of Bofors, the specific questions on Bofors.

SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA: During the last 20 months, this House has discussed this, issue more than a dozen times. I have patiently listened to the

[Shri H. Hanumanthappa]

speeches of the opposition Members; including Mr, Gopalsamy. Most of ihcit speeches aie only repetition. Let hi$_m$ go through the records and see if he has brought anything new. *.(Interruptions))*

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY: Today I have sought very many new clarifications. Are you prepared to meet those points and give clarification?

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Except quoting "'Sunday" interview and quoting some revelations in The Indian Express, nothing new has come, 1 was myself a journalist, and my journalist friends will bear me out. . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Some of them are there.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA; We say if a dog bites a man, it is not news; if a man bites a dog, that is news. That is how we as journalists want to create some s«nsation; otherwise the usual routine thing is no reporting; so some sensation should come out. . .

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: That is ho$_w$ Mr. Gopalsamy make$_s$ news today.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY: Nobody has challenged Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): But he is giving you credit.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I arn only supporting you. These are not new disclosues. The opposition is not interested either [in] the revelations or the disclosures or the truth. If they were really interested, they would have joinej the JPC. The terms were amended according to thei$_r$ wishes, according to 'heir dictation. In spite of that, they did not join, because they n«ve$_r$ wanted to close this issue. That is the reason behind it. Because of Allahabad election, they thought, yes, they had a reason to keep the issue alive. They wer$_e$ talking of Hindi belt, and now results of U.P. elections have come and that is o$_{ne}$ reaso$_n$ they want to keep the issue alive That is theii political game; ihat is the motivation- Tomorrow, what ever Panigrahiji or Pantji may say, they are not prepared to ac* cept it, because they do not wnat to close the file; they somehow or other want to keep it alive till the next election. And they are wanting elections to be preponed. That i$_s$ what they are visualising. They are visualising that elections will come early, $_a$nd because of Congress Party organising a rally, conducting AICC, talking of electoral ieform$_s$ thev feel that there may be elections soon and so they want to keep something alive, because they have no other point to speak outside in the public. They have $_n$o point to make when they go before the people. And now they say our credibility has gone. We do not want to establish our credibility, or the credibility of this Government for your sake; *y^c* are not here by your mercy; we are not he$_{re}$ by your support. Our supporters are our masters, the voters. W$_e$ are here on this side of the House because of ou- masters, and we are answerable to them only. We need not establish our party's credibility o$_r$ our Government's credibility before Mr. Gopalsamy or Mr. Chitta Basu or Mr. Nage$_n$ Saikia or our Telugu Desam friend Mr. Upendra. We rnv'j to establish our credibility before the people of the country who are looking to us and looking to you as well. You feel that people will vote for you; you are asking for removal of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi' and you are dreamine to come to this side of the House. But I have great respect for my voters; they may not be literate; but they are intelligent. Wne$_n$ they did not want the Congress Party, they asked us t$_0$ sit on that side. But you did not provi yourself worthy; you did not behave yourself and in spite of five-yea.- life give$_n$ to you, you went out and the people brought us into majority and put us o$_n$ this side of the House. So. the people of the country are wise enough and whatever may be said or done, the$_y$ ar$_e$ interested in the stability and integMtv of thi country. They are watching us $_a$nd they are watching you also. What are your programmes, they know. After all, the people of this country know which party c$_{an}$ hold the coun-t"$_v$ together and safeguard its integrity and unity and take the country forward. They ure looking at you and t'hey fcttow

that you arc on'y drawing blank. Whatever you rrtay say, in fact you have no progiamme to place before the people. You cannot fool the people. You may fool all the people for some time and some people for all the time but you cannot always fool all the people all the time. . .

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: That very much applies to your Government.

SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA: lt applies to you becaus$_e$ you arc trying to fool the people. I have already said that we are not answerabl$_e$ to you; we need not establish our credibility before you.

~ Coming to accountability, w'nat Mr. Aurora said, what is this JPC leport and what are the terms that you gave as legislators, and what has the Committee come ont with? My point is, any amount of JPCs will not satisfy you. Let us go to the people, but not at your instance. It is ihe prerogative of this Governmsnt and of this party to go before the peoplg because ws are not at your mercy and we cannot do anything on your demand, lt is fo- us to decide rne things. Unfortunately you are not in the position to decide about it. Any amount of shouting$_>$ saying 'Resign' or 'hatao' i$_s$ not going to help and nothing is going to happen. No amount of shouting wil! bring you to this side. You will have to wait till th$_e$ time comes and only the$_n$ the people will decide whom to vote for as they are watching >ou$_r$ performance, you$_r$ policies anj programmes, your unity or Dais or the Fronts; they are watching all this. My point is, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that they are $_n$ot prepared to accept the truth; they are not prepared to accept that a crow is black; they would say it is white. Even during the broad day light if we say it is the sun they will say no. to accept whatever is said by this party. VVhv should we go on beating about the bush? You can go through all the earlier debates on Bofors. Our Prime Minister promised on the floor of the House to appoint a Committee and invited you to join. What was wrong? It" you had the evidence why did yon not appear before th$_e$ JPC and present your evidence. People from opposition visiled Switzerland 17 times. What is the evidence they could get? Why have they not presented that evidence before the JPC? I am not in the habit of hitting below the belt. I do not go into all that; everything is published in the press as to where they have gone and how they spent their days and nights; I do not go into all that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; You must be happy that Chitra Subramanian comes from Bangalore and she has been able to find out all these documents.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: You should appreciate, the Leader of the House has paid tributes to her.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY- She has produced evidence,

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA; Unfortunately, none of you could produce it.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; I agree, we could not; but she has produced this evidence. ,

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL; It is not evidence; it is something else; unfortunately you do not know the difference.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA; People are watching that so much of time of the ftouse has been spent and the entire united opposition has not been able to produce a single evidence. What mor$_e$ you want? Let us go to the people. You come out with your evidence. People will say where y$^{ou}$ should be and where our party should be.

J am concluding, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Unfortunately, w$_e$ have spent a lot of time on this. But the point is that the Opposition is not going to accept whatever version we give. Therefore, we should go on with our work. The caravan should go on. After all ultimately, we ar$_e$ answeiab]$_e$ to our masters, l^et us g$_0$ u> our masters who are

[Shri H. Hanumanthappa]

watching our performance, the performance of the Government. They are watching our programmes, our policies_ our ideologies and our leadership. 'Rajiv Hatao'. This is your slogan today. [s Mr. Gopalsamy going to become the Prime Minister? Have you come to an unanimous decision? Have you reached a consensus in favour of one person? Not yet. Are you going to make Mr. Vajpayee or Mr. Advani or Mr. Gurupadaswamy? No. You are thinking of Mr. V. P. Singh as an alternative. What is the position? He is a person who 'nas been in the Government. Tf he knew that money was going out illegally was he not capable of stoppiig it? He could hav$_e$ resigned on that day itself. j would have admired "im as a hero. He has seen the file. He has approved the file. He has approved all th$_e$ agreements and contracts. Now. because you are out you have com$_e$ out with this plea. People will never forget these things.

SHRT PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Gopalsamy is laughing.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA; 1 know. He has no defence for these things. How can a person who could not step this when h$_e$ had power in his hands, when he had power in his pen, rule ti is country? Can h$_e$ give an alterna.ive Government? Do you think, tha* you can fool the people of this country? If you are dreaming I can only say that you ar$_e$ living in a fool's paradist;.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY; He will be better than Rwiv Gandhi

SHRl H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Let u$_s$ see. Mr. Gopalsamy, I take you back to 1985. When he came to power, everyon$_e$ of your leaders admired Rajiv Gandhi'> administration. Rajiv Gandhi never 'aid publicly 'I am Mr. Clean'. Who s.aid Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was 'Mr. Clean'? lt was the Press and ,the Opposition. They said that b$_e$ was starting on a clean slate and that he was Mr. Clean. Was it wrong that he wanted to be clean? Was it wrong that h$_e$ wanted to be honest? When he started on such a good note, you thought it was a danger singal for you and you realised that it was going to hamper you and it was going to hit you back. Therefore you staited this scandalous and malicious propaganda. I know you arc not going to stop this whatever may be the explanation from the Government .side. You want to keep th$_e$ fire burning till the elections. 1 am sure people will give a fitting answer to this scandalous and malicious propaganda which the Opposition is indulging in. We have faith in the people. We ar$_e$ prepared to go to th$_e$ people with our programmes, with our achievements, with our policies iind with our leadership. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI i. Mr. Matto. Only five minutes.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir, you always give m$_6$ only five minutes. Anyway J will conclude within the Siti pui ated time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): Within three minutes? Thank you.

SHRl GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Sir. I was trying to recollect the two Persian couplet.; which r recited in the bourse of the TV discussion on the bofors deal, before the Joint Parliament-•'iry Committee was constituted, in which Mr. Gurupadaswamy Mr. K. C. Pant, Mr. Masodkar and myself were the participants. I said;

به طواف کعبه رفتم به حرم رهم نه دادند
تو بیرون خانه چه کنی- که درون خانه آئی

I translate it. 'I went to perambulate the Ka'ba but tliey did not allow me in. They said 'what did you do outside that you want to come in?' because being inside rather than outsid$_e$ iR to be in

a privileged position.' \ also recited another verse as this.

تو محرم نیستی محروم ازانی
رو تا محرمان اندر حرم نیست

"You are not known or you do not know so you are deprived of the secrets. there is no place inside for those who are not known." These are the couplets recited by me to the opposition. The opposition Member, Shri Ram Jethmalani has said, it has gone on record, that the opposition must wring their hands in despair for not having participated in ihe Joint Parliamentary Committee on that day. Now they are talking of joining the Parliamentary Committee but it j& no use, they cannot weep over the split milk, those days are gone.

I have to make another point that the people tend to forget the circumstances or the things that come to light. I have followed wifh some attention the things that came in the *Hindu, the lndian Express* and other papers that these people are quoting. When **I** was in **Srinaga^** a photostat copy was given in the *Indian Express* about payments having been made to Svenska. I wanted to show that this was not the new name. In my notes I found that Svenska is incorporated in Panama and an agreement with. Bofors was made by them in 1978 when Congress was not in power. Their directors are the three ladies, whose names are; (1) CF De Perry, (2) V. C. de Podrique and (3) M. R. Sarmiento. This company is registered in Panama but mainly functions in Switzerland. Address in Switzerland is: RUE du Ia Confe. deration, Geneva Switzerland. General consultancy agreement with AB Bofors relating to sales of their products, territory includes lndia, agency terminated in 1986 and payments made to them as winding charges. *(Interruptions).* It is all given in the papers which you are quoting. The poinl at issue is this. Sir, you are a Chartered Accountant. You know it that this agreement was made in 1978 when Shri Rajiv Gandhi was not in power.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He was not in politics at all at that time.

SHRl GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Su, whatever be the nature of this agree ment, we are not going into them5 ac cording to this agreement some pay ments had to be made and Shri V. P. Singh came out with three receipts of payments made to them in lieu of the payments made under that agreement of 1978 although one of those agreements is irrelevant because it does not relate to 155 mm guns. So, the point at issue is that this name "Svenska' which has been made out of proportion by all the media does not contain anything except ing these three ladies. *Ilnterruptions).* Yes. now Shri V. P. Singhi has offered to resign and go to Sanyas if he does not prove it. I am a small man> I do not belong to the ruling party. I am a Miiall man belonging to a small party. I challenge Shri V. P. Singh that I as a small man, will resign my seat from Parliament if he proves till today 1 emphasise 'till today" because what happens tommorrow or day after I do not know—that Rajiv Gandhi had anything to do with Svenska I will resign my seat from Parliament. Merely saying that Svenska payments have been made as a corollary to the agreement that was entered in 1978... *(Intemiptions).* He has produced two-three receipts.

THE VTCE-CflAJRMAN SHRI JAGESH DESAI) The agreement is of 1978.

SHRl GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Those two-three receipts have been pro-duced. One of them does not relate... to 155 m/m guns.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY: I want to congratulate him. Sir.

SHRl GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: I was coming from the Notice Office today about two hours back and on the ticker I saw the news. What was the news? That was not a news given by the Congress Party or Government of India. That was a news given by **the** news agency. The news was the Mr. V. P. Singh had been in a tight comer today in the Lok Sabha because when he was asked to substantiate the charge that Shri Rajiv Gandhi belonged to Svenska, he could not do so. Now he has brought this trouble to himself. Why did

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

he associa- Shri Gandhi with it 1 challenge him even now if he produces—till today—that Shri Rajiv Gandhi's name has figured anywhere in his documents, secret or otherwise, I am going to resign. *I* will not do the way he has done it. He wanted to go into Sanyas. If not todity, it is to be seen if tommor-row he will go into Sanyas or not. But / would request the hon. Minister for Defence that the Prime Minister is on record after the *Hindu* documents were made public, that the matter has been entrusted to CBl for enquiry. I would like to know, when he replies, what Ls the progress of that CBl enquiry and when can we expect some positive thing so that we once and for all close the month of those who say that omething is wrong?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; Next time they will not show any gratitude to you.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the speakers from both sides and some time this suspicion came into my mind whether this Short Duration Discussion is being held on Mr. V. P. Singh or on Bofors. All th$_e$ Opposition speakers have stuck to the Bofors point, but most of tvie Members of the°~ruling party have tried to shift their attack to Mr. V. P. Singh.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA. Dr. Saikia, will you yield for a minute? I will tell you why. It is the disclosure that is important. Who has disclosed it? The initiator has referred to the statements made on the 4th, 5th and 7th. That is why Mr. V. P. Singh has been the target.

SHRl V. GOPALSAMY; He is a nightmare 'or them.

DR. NAGEN SAIKIA: The question is it is not the integrity of Mr. V. P. Singh that is to be discussed; it is the Bofors de? I that we are to discuss.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA; That we are diseussing. But we should be like Caesar's wife in public life before pointing fingers at others.

*DR.* NAGEN SAIKIA; I am coming to that point. When the Joint Parliamentary Committee was formed in accordance with the designs of the ruling party the Opposition was opposed to it and we did not participate on it because we apprehended the futility of it. And time has proved the futility of the JPC. However, we haw; seen that the Prime Minister has been shifting his stand from time to time. His statements haw been proved to be misleading the House and themtion also. He said, as most of t'ne speakers have already stated, that there was no middleman and it has been proved that there were middlemen and there is middleman. Then he said no pay offs \vere made. Now it is proved that pay-offs were made. And now he seems to stand *for* Bofors. I want to know what do these code names Tulip', Lotus', 'Monk Blance' signify? We have come to know from the documents published by the *Hindu* and the documents already disclosed by Mr. V. P. Singh that money was paid into these accounts in the name of Tulip' in the name of 'Lotus' and in ihe name of Mont Blanc' and commissions have been paid upto March, 1987. So, it is the belief of Ihe people of the whole country, that to still the voice of the people and to still the voice of the press, specially in this regard, the Governrnent Defamation Bill passed. Of course, it failed. The people and the press s'ooj unitedly against this move of the Government. Now the time has come, again, when the Bofors gun itself is pointing to the Government.

The honourable Member, Mr. Salve, is not even ready to believe rne documented proof. I would call upon the honourable Membe to tske the challenge to disprove these documents in the highest court of law. The ruling party, the Congress, is enjoying an overwhelming majority and, therefore it always exercises it to feed to its own designs.

One of ihe lady Members. Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan, had attacked, on 'hypothetical grounds, certain Members with a view to giving safeguards to her leader. So did another Member, Shri P. N. Sukul I repeat, the integrity of Mr. V.P. Singh

is not the subject-matte,- of discussion; it is the documents related to Bofors only.

Mr. Jaswant Singh, while speaking about the documents, used a particular word, "authentication." But most of the Mem-hcrs of the ruling party went by the narrow, legal meaning of that word. The Members of t'ne ruling party should know that today nobody believes the Government on this issue. 1 want to warn that today the capital "C" of the Congress stands for '"Corruption", and that is the belief of the people now.

Unde$_r$ these circumstances, why can't the contract with Bofors, because of their violation of it, be cancelled? T urge upon t'ne Government through you. Sir. either to cancel the Bofors contract or, 1 urge upon the Prime Minister to step down. Tbank you.

; THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JA GESH DliSAl): Shri Chitta Basu. Five to seven minutes, please. Mr. Basu, I need not tell you this because I know that you are not going to speak for more than five or six minutes.

| SHRl CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir. you might have listened to the speeches which have been made by many Members in tiiis House. I would only like to draw your attention to the fact that most of the speakers who participated in this debate from the Treasury Benches have sought to eonvey the impression that this debate is meaningless, useless and, merely wastage of time. Sir, with all humility I would like to submit that it is not so, because at least $_a$ few core questions require to be answered by t'ne Government.

| Sir, three core questions have bee$_n$ posed or have been thrown up during the course of the debate: Frstly, whether the Government have misled this Parliament and the nation as a whole o$_n$ the issue of the Bofor$_s$ gu$_n$ deal. Secondly, whether there is the necessity Of having a fresh look into the matter, after the JPC's report. Thirdly, whether or not there have been som$_e$ grievous lapses on the part of the Government in the matter of proceeding witVi the investigation into the matter in Switzerland. These are the three core questions which have bee$_n$ thrown up by today's debate. Sir. allow me to say that

So far as the first question, that is, whether the House has been misled, is concerned, it has been proved that the Gov-rnment has take$_n$ shifting positions from time to time. It has take$_n$ not only shifting positions but some conflicting positions which $_c$annot be icconciled. I cite Only one or two instances. Earlier, right fro$_{nl}$ the beginning Government, including the Piim$_e$ Minister, has bee$_n$ saying that there were no middleme$_n$ anj that there was no payment made. Then a shift took place. Theie were midlemen earlier but that at our instance their services Were terminated and that whatever P$^3$Y-tnent was made in the form or in the shape of winding up charges. Is it not a shift? Thirdly, that there were nayments 6uC mat no *Indian received the* Payment. Sir, I leave it to you. Is it not a. shift of position?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Basu, when Bofors Save the information to the Government that they were winding up charges, at that point of time if the Government Said that they were winding up charges, ^nd no$_w$ if something els$_e$ i$_s$ there, is it a Vnift?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: This is my hoint. You have rightly caught mp point. Hie issue, one of the core questions to-<iay is whether there has been any shift <)f position of the-Government and whether this 'na$_s$ led to the misleading of the blouse. That is the question, and I am leally happy that you have caught my boint and said. "Yes ther$_e$ ha$_s$ been some Shift."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JA GESH DESAI): No, no, $_n$o, Mr. Basu. \ said contrary to that, tint it is not a Shift. At that point of time the Govern rnent had that information. If some other information cornes tp the Govermment, 's it a shift?

SHRr CHITTA BASU: All right. Even Accepting your interpretation, I may put Another question to you if you permit rne: Does it prove the ability $_0$f the Gov-trnment? Does it prov$_e$ the efficiency of the Government? lt has miserably failed to keep the nation informed about the Veal state of affairs with regard to Bofors.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

Now, lastly, the Prime Minister cornes in. *The* latest thing is, he says, if com-missio$_n$ was paij for the Bofors gun dea! fo$_r$ some genuine work, then, we cannot question it, we should not think otherwise.

Anyway, my first point is this. There have bee$_n$ shifts. Tnere have bee$_n$ conflicting shifts. There hav$_e$ been conflicting positio$_{ns}$ taken by the Government which ultimately proves the inefficiency of the Government and inesponsibility of the Government which has cioded very much t'ne credibility of the Government.

Now, about whethe,. ther$_e$ has bee$_n$ a new revelation, I do not say that this is a revelation, I do say it is a disclosure, but certainly you hav$_e$ to agree that a certain new situation has developed after the last debate o$_n$ the "THE HINDU" disclosure. So far as "THE HINDU" •disclosure is concerned, the Government wanted to assure us that the CBI was going into or investigating into the authenticity of the documents. It wanted to put a Hd On the controversy on thai giound. Now, whether it is fro$_m$ Mr. V. P. Singh or it is from "THE HINDU" disclosuie, the hard 'facts, the irrefutable facts, the incontrovertible facts are two: I would mention only two. These two facts are that the commissions were paid and that they were paid in lieu of materials supplied. And t'his has been saij by Mr. V. P. Singh. It is immaterial for me whether it is a revelation made by Mr. V. P. Singh o$_r$ by anybody else or whether it is the same revelatio$_n$ as that af the HINDU publication. But the fact remains, particularly after t'ne comment of the Prime Minister that commissions have bee$_n$ paid. If those commissions have bee$_n$ paid for genuine work we have got nothing to grudge. But ultimately this point is leading to the position that commission has been pai'd â"'d paid in lieu of certain so-called genuin$_e$ work rendered by some agent. This is a great change. This is the new element in the whole situation. This is a hard fncf. The Government has to repudiate it H»J anybody repudiated it?

Eve$_n$ [he Leader of the House has to repudiate it. Up till now he has not re. pudiate$_t$i it. Nor has the Government repudiated jt. Let us wait and see what the Defence Minister or anybody else says in the reply. But this is one hard fact and it needs to be answered.

Secondly, payments wer$_e$ not i$_n$ the shape of winding up charges because the payments were made after the gun-deai was signed. Those payments were made in December 1986 $_{an(}$j March 1987 while the agreement was signed on March 24, 1986. In this connection I want to draw the attention of th<: House to t'ne essence of the JPC Report. Pne essence of the IPC leport is $_a$nd T quote:

> 'There is no evidence to show that any middleman was involved in the process of acquisition $_0$f the Bofors guns. There is also no evidence to substantiate the allegation of commission, bribes having been paid fo anyone."

Now, in the light of these two facts, as I said irrefutable and incontrovertible facts, do you mean to say that *the JPC's Beport still continues* to be sacrosanct? My feeling is that with these hard irrefutable facts this JPC Report had been invalidated because of its findings that there was *no* commission paid and no middlemen are involved. Now who is to answer? If these two positions are correct, the findings of the JPC have been invalidated. If JPC Report is invalidated in the context of these incontrovertible facts, ther$_e$ is a need for a fresh look into the whole thing.

THE VICEI-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH* DESAI): Please conclude now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: The third point which I raised is whether there have been lapses on the part of the Governrnent to proceed sincerety with the investigation in the foreign countries with regard to ascertaining or unveilling the truth regarding the stashed-away money. But this is what we have been reported. If they want

to give us any iniormation, it is welcome, but I would place two facts which are in my possession. I have got many points, but I want to quote
[1] only two points.

THE, VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI).- You have taken eleven ′ minutes. You can take only one minute now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I would | place only two facts. It ig alleged thar Mr. Lars Ringberg, the Swedish Public Prosecutor, terminated his inquiry not because of any non-cooperation , from, the hanks, hut hecause i of the advice of somebody else. Somebody says it was the advice of the Foreign Minister of the Swedish Government. Now, a suspicion aii^es. How is it? Why? For what reason the Minister of Foreign Affairs who is related to the Minister of External Affairs of the Swiss-Government has found it feasible to advise or to re-. quest Lars; Rinberg not fo proceed with the enquiry? [f it is so, if it is correct, the House has got the right to know the truth about it.

The second point which I want to make is that it is reported that the Government at a certain point of time agreed to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with t'ne Swiss Government because the Swiss Government needed that kind of Memorandum) of Understanding[1] to have access to the facts with the Swiss Banks. Now, it is reported that the Government has back tracked and did not fulfil its commitment given to the House that they are sincere in pursuing the matter.

The last point is that our Prime Minister has lamented recently that he has received the political beatings. Sir, I would only like to say.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): What?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Political beatings.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He did not lament.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: It is my interpretation. What was the necessity of making that statement at the crucial time? He may be proud of it but I say he lamented and he has to wait for many more laments.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: $H_e$ did not lament. He said it boldly that he is prepared *lo* take beating pe;-sonallv for the sake of the country,

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Let him; become bolder, then, it becomes good ior the country.

Now. £ *say* he has lamented. Yuu say he has not lamented. Sir, he is> entitled to his view and I am entitled to my view. As I am entitled to my view, I say, he has lamented. But I say th nt he will have to wait for more beatings at the hustings because he is under a cloud, that is, the general people have already come to this conclusion that the credibility of the Prime Minister has touched very lowest. It is not a matter of pride. He *may* feel it as a matter of pride. But as an Indian, as a Member ol Parliament, we feel ashamed about it because in a democratic institution, in a democratic set-up. the Prime Minister represents the whole nation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): You have taken 15 minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I am concluding.

SHRl CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: He started lamenting. He will take some more time.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I could not follow . . . (Interruptions.) . . . You need more time to lament All right, you are allowed more time to lament

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI. After the Opposition have deserted him, he is lamenting.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Lastly, *1* will say, I am shocked to find out that the Prime Minister of the country Junctions as a Public Relations Officer of the AB Bofors Company. It is a matter of great shame and it *L* a matter of shame for the nation as a whole

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I will begin from wherd the hon. Member, Shri Chitta Ba^u ended. I will begin with a proposition to the Government that in consideration of the peculiar situation of the Prime Minister with regard to AB Bofors, with regard to treaty or agreement with AB Bofors and subsequent clarification that he continues to be on behalf of AB Bofors, it is neat and proper that this debate which concerns foremost our Prime Minister be replied to by the Prime Minister himself clarifying all the doubt? which have been raised in 9.Q0 p.m. connection with the deai. . "* Firstly, for a long time, on the Short Duration discussion, listening to the speeches particularly from the Treasury Benches. I was reminded of some old scenes in this particular House. Perhaps, yesterday or day before yesterday was the birthday of late lamented Piloo Mody. He was in the habit of sometimes pointing out at the Congress Benches and jokingly saying, "they are all bonded labour". I heard him repeat this statement even before Shrimati Indira Gandhi. I do not like this term to be used in respect oF ;i political party. But while listening to all the speeches, I was just wondering what made the Members from, that side display so much energy in defending an ever-shifting position of the Government on this particular issue. 1 don't go into the details. But perhaps, the issues are very simple. TI was stated by the Govermment, by no less a person than the Prime Minister, that through a direct negotiation with the Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Olof Palme, it was agreed or rather it was enjoined on A.B. Bofors that no commission should be paid. Later on, the Prime Minister is on record, having said that even if one is found guilty on this count, he would be penalised. Now the payment of commission has been proved incontro-vertibly but the question of punish-ment has gone in the background ane! now our Prime Minister has floated a hypothetical argument. It might have been paid for industrial espion ;ige as if industrial espionage was not an espionage and it was a very holy act. During all these discussions, thi most noteworthy thing has been that when the question of cancelling th 2 Bofor$_s$ agreement came for violation of conditions, many arguments were put forth, why it could not be done the foremost of them being that it will cause a delay in acquiring this type of gun. The delay may be of a very long duration in negotiating everything anew and at the same time, we would lose a huge amount in terms of the payment made. When this was done, were not precautions taken to prevent the merchants of destruction as the Bofors is—armaments industry as such is nothing short of that*—they stoop at nothing at selling their merchandise. Even they are not prevented from: starting a war in order to sell their merchandise. When entering into an agreement with such *n* company, who has a very ill-reputation even in Sweden for violation of Swedish rules, why due care was not taken that the conditions are enforced If that is not being done, whose responsibility is it? Is it of Opposition or i$_s$ it of the Govern-ment? I will just tell you one thing Malpractices cannot be made to stand by virtue of majority. Majority, however brute it may be, either in this House or in that House—the ronfidence of thisi House doe[1]! not

matter; the confidence ol' that House matters—alone will not help. With his stupendous majority, it is impossible i'Or any one particularly the highest executive of the country, to go scot free either for malpracticeg or for irresponsibility. This must be kept in mind by the Treasury Benches with all their prevarications led by the Leader of the House when he said that "commission, if paid, iu order to influence...." That is the crucial thing in this particular case. The Leader of the House is an ex-Justice, a very eminent lawyer. Does he not see that this is bringing in a new question, once the question has been settled? It does not speak ol the strength of the case of the Government. Nobody is interested, at least not myself, in undermining the defence of the country. Many 4i.1e.3-tions have been raised in connection with the entire affair. I have, thorefore, suggested that if the Prime Minister is sure of his bona fides, let him come before the House with un open heart, make a clean breast of everything, try to convince the entire house that he is sincere. If it is otherwise, then the responsibility for playing with the country's defence, for utilising the country's defence in partisan interest, in personal interest, will be theirs. In one form or the other, retribution will catch the party which is ruling over the destiny it the couutry in a very cavauer manner, in a very less-than-honest manner and in a very self-satisfying manner, if they are unable to clear all these doubts. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Vicef-Chairman, Sir, before you adjourn the House, I would like to compliment Mr. V. Gopalsamy besides the last speaker, Mr. Bhattacharjee, for being present here from the Opposition side because there is *none* other to defend Shri V. P. Singh's allegations or to show the seriousness about the subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRl JAGESH DESAI): But I must aiso make it very clear that Mr. Dipen Ghosh and Mr. Chaturanan Mishra took my permission. They left only after taking my permission. (Interrup ruptions). About two, I can talk. Now, the discussion is concluded and the Minister will reply tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned and will meet again on 16th November, 1988 at 11 a.m.

The House then adjourned at ten minutes past nine of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the

November, 1988.